#### **Deposition of:**

Douglas Thompson, M.D.

#### Case:

Jeffery A. Weisman, et al.

VS

Barnes-Jewish Hospital, et al.

Date:

11-03-2022



Jenery A. Weisman, et al. vs barnes-Jewish Hospital, et al.
IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI EASTERN DIVISION
<pre>JEFFERY A. WEISMAN, et al., )</pre>
Deposition of DOUGLAS THOMPSON, M.D., taken on
Behalf of the Plaintiffs.
November 3, 2022
Reported by Sandra Meintrup, CCR, CSR

```
1
               IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
              FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
 2
                        EASTERN DIVISION
 3
     JEFFERY A. WEISMAN, et al.,
 4
                                      )
          Plaintiffs,
                                      )
 5
                                      ) NO. 4:19-cv-75-JAR
     vs.
 6
     BARNES JEWISH HOSPITAL, et al.,
 7
          Defendants.
                                      )
 8
 9
              Deposition of DOUGLAS THOMPSON, M.D.,
10
     produced, sworn and examined on the 3rd day of
11
     November, 2022, between the hours of nine o'clock in
12
     the forenoon and three o'clock in the afternoon of that
13
     day in the law offices of Shands, Elbert, Gianoulakis &
14
     Giljum, LLP, 8235 Forsyth Boulevard, Suite 700, in the
15
     County of St. Louis, State of Missouri, before Sandra
     Meintrup, CCR #614, in a certain cause now pending in
16
17
     the United States District Court for the Eastern
18
     District of Missouri, Eastern Division, between JEFFERY
19
     A. WEISMAN, et AL., Plaintiffs, vs. BARNES JEWISH
20
     HOSPITAL, et al., Defendants; on behalf of the
21
     Plaintiffs.
22
23
24
25
```

1	CERTIFIED QUESTIONS
2	QUESTION NO. 1: PAGE 162 LINE 23
3	Q. What was that person's name?
4	
5	QUESTION NO. 2: PAGE 163 LINE 24
6	Q. Okay. And you know the person's name and
7	you're going to decline to provide it; is that right?
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21 22	
23	
24	
25	

	, ,	
1	INDEX	
2	Direct Examination by Mr. Elster	Page 7
3		
4		
5	INDEX OF EXHIBITS	
6	Plaintiff's Exhibit:	
7	1, LinkedIn page	Page 10
8	2, e-mail	Page 85
9	3, e-mails	Page 91
10	4, e-mail	Page 95
11	5, e-mails	Page 98
12	6, e-mail warning document	Page 105
13	7, e-mails	Page 109
14	8, e-mails	Page 119
15	9, e-mail transfer recommendation	Page 121
16	10, e-mails	Page 122
17	11, e-mails Stanford U.	Page 131
18	12, Letter of Recommendation and e-mails	Page 136
19	13, e-mails	Page 141
20	14, ABA documents	Page 141
21	15, e-mails	Page 146
22	16, e-mails and Weisman documents	Page
23	17, e-mails and LoR	Page
24	18, e-mails	Page 146
25	19, e-mails	Page 151

1	INDEX OF EXHIBITS continued
2	Plaintiff's Exhibit:
3	20, e-mail with authorization and release Page 71
4	21, e-mails Page 154
5	22, e-mail Page 155
6	23, e-mail Page 156
7	24, e-mails Page 157
8	25, e-mails Page 164
9	
10	
11	APPEARANCES
12	
13	For Plaintiffs: The Elster Law Office, LLC
14	Attorneys at Law
15	225 South Meramec, Suite 325
16	St. Louis, Missouri 63105
17	By: Mr. Henry P. Elster
18	henry@elsterlaw.com
19	
20	Marek Weisman LLC
21	Attorneys At Law
22	55 East Monroe Street, Suite 3800
23	Chicago, Illinois 60603
24	By: Ms. Rachel C. Rutter
25	rrutter@marekweisman.com

	,	
1		APPEARANCES CONTINUED
2		
3	For Washington Un	iversity Defendants:
4		Shands, Elbert, Gianoulakis &
5		Giljum, LLP
6		Attorneys at Law
7		8235 Forsyth Boulevard, Suite 700
8		St. Louis, Missouri 63105
9		By: Mr. Kevin Anthony Sullivan
10		ksullivan@shandselbert.com
11		
12	For Defendants BJ	C and BJH:
13		Husch Blackwell
14		Attorneys at Law
15		190 Carondelet Plaza, Suite 600
16		St. Louis, Missouri 63105
17		By: Ms. Theresa Mullineaux
18		theresa.mullineaux@huschblackwell.com
19		
20	Videographer:	360 Litigation Services
21		Curt Shaw
22		
23	Also present:	Jeffery A. Weisman
24		
25		

1	VIDEOGRAPHER: We're on the record at 9:31
2	a.m. Today's date is November 3rd, 2022. We're here
3	today for deposition of Dr. Douglas Thompson to be
4	taken in the matter of Jeffery A. Weisman, et al.,
5	versus Barnes Jewish Hospital, currently pending in the
6	United States District Court for the Eastern District
7	of Missouri, Eastern Division. Cause No.
8	4:19-CV-75-JAR.
9	At this time I would ask Counsel to give their
10	appearances for the record, beginning with the taking
11	party.
12	MR. ELSTER: Henry Elster for the Plaintiffs
13	MS. RUTTER: Rachel Rutter for the Plaintiffs.
14	MR. SULLIVAN: Kevin Sullivan for the
15	Washington University defendants.
16	MS. MULLINEAUX: Theresa Mullineaux for
17	Defendants BJC and BJH.
18	VIDEOGRAPHER: Very good. Will the reporter
19	please swear in the witness.
20	DOUGLAS THOMPSON, M.D.,
21	of lawful age, being duly sworn to tell the truth, the
22	whole truth, and nothing but the truth, deposes and
23	says on behalf of the Plaintiffs, as follows:
24	DIRECT EXAMINATION
25	BY MR. ELSTER:

1	Q.	Please state your name.
2	A.	Douglas Royce Thompson.
3	Q.	
4	A.	1400 Fawnvalley Drive, St. Louis.
5	Q.	Have you ever had your deposition taken
6	before?	
7	A.	No.
8	Q.	Have you ever testified in court before?
9	A.	No.
10	Q.	Have you ever been listed as an expert witness
11	in any c	ourt proceeding?
12	A.	No.
13	Q.	Have you ever been a party to a lawsuit
14	before?	
15	A.	No.
16	Q.	What did you do to prepare for the deposition
17	today ot	her than talking to your attorney?
18	A.	I'm sorry, what was the question?
19	Q.	What did you do to prepare for the deposition
20	today?	
21	A.	Spoke with the attorney. And then I reviewed
22	document	s that were supplied to me.
23	Q.	What documents did you review?
24	A.	Mostly e-mails.
25	Q.	What types of e-mails?

A. E-mails between myself, Dr. Benzinger.
E-mails that were forwarded to me from Dr. Benzinger,
Dr. Cox. That's most of it.
Q. Anything else?
A. Not that I can think of off the top of my
head.
Q. How long did you prepare for the deposition
today?
A. You mean how much time did I spend with Kevin
Sullivan?
Q. That in addition to any other preparation you
did.
A. I think Mr. Sullivan and I spent about two and
a half hours together on Tuesday. And then I reviewed
some documents this morning for maybe a half hour.
Q. Was anyone else present for the meeting
earlier this week with Mr. Sullivan?
A. Joe Sklansky was there for about an hour. He
left after about an hour.
Q. Any other prep before Tuesday?
A. I think I looked at some of the documents in
the e-mail when I first got the e-mail from Mr.
Sullivan.
Q. When was that?
A. I don't recall the date. It would have been

1	whatever day the e mail was sent to me
	whatever day the e-mail was sent to me.
2	Q. Do you remember roughly what week it was?
3	A. I could look in my phone and retrieve the
4	e-mail.
5	Q. Was it this month; do you know?
6	A. It was well, it's November, right? So I'm
7	not sure if it was this month or the end of October.
8	Q. Okay. Okay. If you can look at Exhibit No.
9	1, what is that?
10	A. Looks like my LinkedIn page.
11	Q. I want to go through some of the information
12	on it. Did you create your LinkedIn page?
13	A. Yes.
14	Q. Okay. If you can flip to page 3 of that. And
15	four.
16	A. Uh-huh.
17	Q. Is your educational background accurate
18	beginning on pages on page 4?
19	A. Yep.
20	Q. Okay. And that would include the Indiana
21	University, the Children's Memorial Hospital-
22	Northwestern, University of Colorado, and University of
23	California, San Diego?
24	A. Yep. Yes.
25	Q. Okay. You became the associate residency

1	program director at Washington University in the
2	Department of Radiology in August of 2017?
3	MR. SULLIVAN: Radiology or anesthesiology?
4	Q. (By Mr. Elster) Sorry.
5	A. In 2017, correct.
6	Q. What does that job entail?
7	A. I was new to the institution so mostly that
8	job was getting the lay of the land before I took over
9	as residency program director.
10	Q. So was it primarily a training position to be
11	residency director?
12	A. I'm not sure that I would describe it as
13	training. It was mostly gaining a familiarity.
14	Q. And that would take about a year to gain
15	familiarity?
16	A. I think a year was the planned transition time
17	between myself and Dr. Benzinger.
18	Q. Was Dr. Benzinger the head of the department
19	before you were?
20	A. No, Dr. Evers was the head of the department.
21	Dr. Benzinger was the residency program direct.
22	Q. So Dr. Benzinger occupied that position. You
23	were kind of the heir apparent for that position?
24	A. Correct.
25	Q. All right. What does it mean when you say

1	getting the lay of the land?
2	A. So as it's defined on that page, I started my
3	career at Seattle Children's, which is a completely
4	separate institution in a completely separate state.
5	So getting the lay of the land, what I mean by that is
6	getting to know the people that are involved in the
7	program. Getting to know the residents. Getting to
8	know the clinical environment as well, because I'm
9	still a clinician.
10	Q. Was it a full-time position?
11	A. Can you clarify what you mean? I mean, I am a
12	1.0 FTE. I'm a full-time employer or employee. But
13	the administrative job is not full time.
14	Q. Okay. So I guess can you explain, and I'm
15	focused on August 2017 to July 2018.
16	A. Uh-huh.
17	Q. You were a clinician during that time period?
18	A. Yes.
19	Q. And in addition to that, focus on what the
20	function of the associate residency program director
21	was.
22	A. Correct.
23	Q. And other than getting familiarity with people
24	and gaining familiarity with the program, what other
25	responsibilities did that include?

1	A. With regards to the associate program
2	director?
3	Q. Yes.
4	A. Understanding more about the logistics of how
5	their particular program works.
6	Q. Okay. Did you have any supervising
7	responsibility?
8	A. As a clinician? Or as a
9	Q. First as an associate residency program
10	director.
11	A. That's not the way I would characterize it. I
12	mean, the supervising role would have fallen to Dr.
13	Benzinger.
14	Q. Okay. Did you do any oversight of residents?
15	A. Again, if you're if you're asking as the
16	associate residency program director, did I do
17	oversight, it gets a little complicated. Because I do
18	oversight as a clinician and so those two do overlap.
19	Q. As a clinician did you do any supervising or
20	oversight during this time period?
21	A. Of course.
22	Q. Did any of that supervising or oversight
23	extend to Dr. Jeffery Weisman?
24	A. During that time I don't recall.
25	Q. What about during the time period after that

1	ending in July of 2018, was there any supervising or
2	oversight that you personally did with Dr. Weisman?
3	A. I don't recall. I think that's around the
4	time that Dr. Weisman left.
5	Q. Which specific time period?
6	A. Around July of 2018.
7	Q. Did you ever work with him?
8	A. I did.
9	Q. As a clinician?
10	A. I did.
11	Q. How many times?
12	A. I would guess a handful of times.
13	Q. Do you have any recollection when the first
14	one was?
15	A. I don't have any recollection of the first
16	time I worked with him, no.
17	Q. What about the second time?
18	A. I don't recall the second time I worked with
19	him. If your question is do I recall specific
20	instances where I worked with him, yes. Can I
21	characterize those as first or second, no.
22	Q. What specific instances do you recall?
23	A. There was an instance where we were at the
24	Children's Hospital 'cause that's where I worked
25	primarily. I believe my assignment was just with Dr.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Weisman, meaning I didn't have any other rooms to I believe the patient was an orthopedic supervise. patient. The patient was asleep. The surgery was in I left briefly, maybe to use the rest room progress. or for some other reason. When I came back it became apparent that Dr. Weisman had tried to refill the vaporizer, which is essentially the mechanism that supplies gas or volatile anesthetic to a patient to keep them asleep. He was successful in refilling the vaporizer; however, he was not successful in reengaging the vaporizer with the So the patient was not receiving a continuous machine. supply of gas anesthetic, which would have put the patient at risk for what we call recall, which is awareness under anesthesia or waking up in the middle of the procedure. Was this the first -- one of the first times you worked with him? I don't recall if it was the first, second, Α. third time I worked with him. It's just an incident that stuck in my mind for obvious reasons. This was at Children's Hospital? **Q.** Α. Correct. Was anyone else working with you and Dr. Q. Weisman at the time?

1	A. I don't believe so, no. You mean from an
2	anesthesia perspective?
3	Q. Correct.
4	A. No.
5	Q. Do you recall any other specific instances in
6	which
7	A Working with Dr. Weisman?
8	Q. Right.
9	A. No.
10	Q. Do you recall generally that you may have
11	worked with him on other occasions?
12	A. It's possible but I don't recall any details.
13	Q. Do you know if Dr. Weisman ever received any
14	formal disciplinary action from the anesthesiology
15	department at Washington University?
16	A. I do not know any details about that, no.
17	Q. You don't know one way or the other?
18	A. I don't know one way or another.
19	Q. Do you know if there were any discussions
20	about him?
21	A. Discussions about him?
22	Q. Receiving formal disciplinary action.
23	A. I believe there were, yes.
24	Q. What do you know about that?
25	A. I think before Dr. Weisman left there was

discussions about what would be the most appropriate
way to sort of go forward with the American Board of
Anesthesiology. Yeah.
Q. Who were parties to those discussions?
A. Dr. Benzinger. I believe Dr. Cox was looped
into that conversation. It's possible that Dr. Groener
was as well. Myself.
Q. And to be clear, you don't know if there was
ever any formal disciplinary action that was proposed?
A. So, I did ask that question at some point of
Dr. Benzinger. Because after Dr. Weisman left I had to
fill out some regulatory documents. And in that
communication I was led to believe that no formal
disciplinary action had been taken.
Q. Okay. Other than that one incident you
specifically recall, do you have any other specific
memories of personally observing Dr. Weisman working as
a clinician and a medical provider?
A. That's really the only instance that comes to
mind.
Q. Do you have any views about his capabilities
as an anesthesiologist?
A. Can you clarify what you mean? I mean, he
never finished a residency so I wouldn't think that
he'd be qualified to practice anesthesiology.

1	Q. Outside of a rigid completing the
2	anesthesiologist program, I guess I'll rephrase it.
3	Do you have any views about his capabilities
4	as an anesthesiology resident?
5	A. I think I think the general consensus of
6	his performance was that he was probably behind where
7	many of his peers were. I think there was a discussion
8	about whether or not he would ever catch up to where
9	his peers were or where he should be.
10	I think, you know, there were some reviews of
11	him that were poor, meaning the reviewer felt that he
12	was performing poorly. I think there were other
13	reviews where it seemed to indicate that he was perhaps
14	on par with where he should be.
15	So in general I'd say it was a mix mixed
16	bag.
17	Q. When you say general consensus, general
18	consensus between who?
19	A. Between those that were conducting reviews.
20	Q. And who would that be?
21	A. I'm sorry?
22	Q. Who would that be?
23	A. Well, I mean, in general the clinicians that
24	were working with him. And also the rotation
25	coordinators for the various rotations that he

1	completed.
2	Q. Were you ever did you ever do any reviews
3	of Dr. Weisman?
4	A. I I don't recall. If I worked with him in
5	a clinician oversight capacity, I probably filled out
6	an evaluation. But I don't have any details.
7	Q. Were you ever rotation coordinator for him?
8	A. I was not.
9	Q. When you say the general consensus, was that
10	also your belief?
11	A. Well, certainly the instance that I recall
12	where he forgot to fill the vaporizer is concerning.
13	And, yes, I would say that that would be concerning for
14	being below par with his peers, yes.
15	Q. Have you ever communicated with anyone else in
16	another residency program in the United States about
17	Dr. Weisman?
18	A. So, I know because I've looked at documents
19	that I had a phone call with Dr. Macario, who I believe
20	is at Stanford. But I do not recall any details of
21	that phone call.
22	I believe I've also communicated via e-mail
23	with somebody from Duke, but I never spoke with her on
24	the phone.
25	O. Who was the individual at Duke?

1	A. I don't recall her name. Epling perhaps, Dr.
2	Epling. I'm not confident of that name.
3	Q. Outside of people at Washington University,
4	have you ever expressed what you term the general
5	consensus about Dr. Weisman to anybody else?
6	MR. SULLIVAN: Object to form. Vague.
7	Go ahead and answer.
8	A. Outside of Wash U., other than the instances
9	that you just elucidated?
10	Q. (By Mr. Elster) Correct.
11	A. I don't recall.
12	Specific to the common general consensus?
13	Q. Correct.
14	A. I don't recall, no.
15	Q. What about otherwise, any communications about
16	Dr. Weisman with anyone else?
17	A. On the request of Dr. Weisman documents were
18	sent to Chicago, Dr and Louisiana. I think those
19	were Dr. Fox and Dr. Kaye, K-a-y-e.
20	Q. Anyone else outside of those people?
21	A. I mean, there was a Dr. Patil, P-a-t-i-l.
22	Q. Anyone else?
23	A. Not that I recall off the top of my head.
24	Q. When you became residency program director in
25	July of 2018, what were your responsibilities?

1	A. That's a pretty broad question. I mean,
2	responsibilities to make sure that the program stays in
3	the good graces of ACGME. You're responsible for
4	resident recruitment. The oversight of the various
5	fellowships there are at Wash U. also fall under the
6	program director. You have oversight over the 80 plus
7	residents that are in the program.
8	Q. When you say good graces of the ACGME, what
9	does that stand for?
10	A. Well, there's a lot of regulatory requirements
11	that the ACGME puts forth. And so try to navigate all
12	the requirements and make sure that you're meeting
13	their benchmarks.
14	Q. Are you familiar with any requirements from
15	the ACGME as it relates to a residency's training
16	file resident's training file?
17	A. Can you be more specific?
18	Q. Sure. Is there any documentation that you're
19	aware of that the ACGME requires to keep in connection
20	with the residents training at a particular institute?
21	A. The ACGME requires that we submit milestones.
22	Q. What do you mean by milestones?
23	A. I mean, the best way I would describe it is
24	you're trying to judge as best you can as a trainee
25	progresses through the program whether or not they're

reaching certain benchmarks in what is deemed an
appropriate time so that they can complete the training
program on time with their peers.
Q. When you say submit them, submit to who?
A. Submit to the ACGME.
Q. So as far as you're aware, outside of those
milestones, is there any other documents that needed to
be submitted to the ACGME?
A. Are you asking at the time that I was the
residency director or are you asking now?
Q. Well, I'll ask both. So at the time you were
the residency director what needed to be submitted?
And then I'll ask now.
A. So at the time I was the residency, in
addition to the milestones we also submitted whether or
not a resident completed the program. And I think that
that was the extent of my knowledge at the time.
Q. Okay. What about now?
A. So subsequent I believe I subsequent to me
being the program director there was this question at
the ACGME meeting raised about a summative evaluation
of the residents.
Q. So you said subsequent. When did you stop?
Because your at least the LinkedIn page says present
as program director.

1	A. So I would have stopped, I believe it was
2	September of last year.
3	Q. Okay. So I'll just so September of 2021
4	would be the end date when you were the program
5	director?
6	A. That sounds right.
7	Q. And I'll ask, at that time you became vice
8	chair for education?
9	A. Correct.
10	Q. I'll get to that in a second.
11	So subsequent to September of 2021 you learned
12	that there was something called an ACGME summative
13	evaluation?
14	A. I believe it was subsequent to me leaving the
15	role of residency program director, correct.
16	Q. What is an ACGME summative evaluation?
17	A. So traditionally what the program did was once
18	the resident finished training, we would put together a
19	fairly standardized letter that listed the various
20	competencies put forth by the ACGME, which I won't be
21	able to sum all but there's five. So like
22	professionalism, medical knowledge, system based
23	practice. There's a couple others.
24	So the document kind of reviews those
25	competencies and states that the resident met those

1	competencies. It also talks about a quality
2	improvement project that they were involved in. And it
3	talks about a research project that they were involved
4	in. And then sort of the concluding paragraph is that
5	the resident met all of these requirements and is
6	competent to practice anesthesiology.
7	So that is what we felt as a program was meant
8	by a summative evaluation.
9	Q. Okay. And that was supposed to be submitted
10	when?
11	A. So I don't believe I knew that specifically
12	when I was the program director. But subsequently I
13	found out that it's 30 days after the graduation.
14	Q. So it's your understanding currently that the
15	ACGME requirements mean that you have to submit a
16	summative evaluation 30 days after someone matriculates
17	from the residency program?
18	A. After someone finishes the program, yes.
19	Q. Finishes the program?
20	A. Correct.
21	Q. Okay. And that doesn't necessarily mean they
22	graduate?
23	A. Those are different things, yes.
24	Q. Right. So it's a 30 day from cessation, from
25	when it stops?

A. It's 30 days from completing the program.
Q. Okay. So it's so when you say completing
the program, so that would be completing the entire
residency program?
A. Correct.
Q. So if someone were to leave before the
completion of the residency program would there be a
requirement for a summative evaluation?
A. So again, if you're asking what my
understanding was when I was the program director?
Q. Right.
A. I did not know that there was such a
requirement.
Q. Okay. So subsequent to September of 2021 is
it now your belief there is a requirement for that?
A. It's now my understanding the ACGME requires
that, yes.
Q. So if someone were to leave, it's a four- or a
five-year residency program?
A. Four years.
Q. Four years. If someone were to leave for any
reason six months in, it is your current understanding
there is a summative evaluation required within 30 days
of departure?
A. Correct.

1	Q. Okay. And the summative evaluation would
2	consist of essentially an assessment for all of those
3	five knowledge areas?
4	A. Correct.
5	Q. Okay. Who who completes the summative
6	evaluation now?
7	A. So are you asking when a when a resident
8	finishes the program?
9	Q. Correct.
10	A. Graduates?
11	Q. What's the process for compliance?
12	A. So program director, which is Dr. Mitchell,
13	would complete that.
14	Q. Dr. Mitchell exclusively?
15	A. Yes, I believe so. I mean, she might have
16	some administrative help but it's Dr. Mitchell that
17	completes them.
18	Q. Okay.
19	A. It may not be Dr. Mitchell that submits them
20	to the ACGME.
21	Q. Okay.
22	A. But she's the one that fills out the
23	Q. And what information is relied upon? Because
24	if the head doesn't supervise the physician or the
25	resident, how are they to complete the summative

1	evaluation?
2	A. They review the resident's file and they
3	also we meet with the residents twice a year. And
4	so part of that biannual discussion is covering things
5	like what was their research project, what was their QI
6	project, who was their mentor.
7	Q. Okay. What changed subsequent to you leaving
8	as program director to where you now believe the
9	it's required 30 days from departure?
10	A. Well, it was brought to our attention by the
11	ACGME.
12	Q. The ACGME. And how did they do that?
13	A. The communications via e-mail.
14	Q. Do you remember when approximately that was
15	received?
16	A. I don't.
17	Q. Was it directed to you?
18	A. I don't think the initial outreach from the
19	ACGME was distributed to me but I could be wrong.
20	Q. If not you, do you have any understanding of
21	who it would have been directed to?
22	A. It might have been directed to Tia Drake,
23	who's the DIO, which is essentially the University's
24	liaison with the ACGME.
25	Q. Okay. So is it fair to say that after

1	September of 2021 the practice of the Department of
2	Anesthesiology is 30 days of when a resident leaves
3	there is now a summative evaluation?
4	MR. SULLIVAN: I'll object to form. Vague.
5	Go ahead and answer.
6	(Discussion was held off the record.)
7	A. So I would argue that we were already in
8	compliance with that in that it's unusual for a
9	resident to leave the program before completing the
10	program. So what we were doing was in compliance.
11	It's in the instance where we have somebody leave the
12	program early we were unaware of this requirement for a
13	summative evaluation.
14	Q. (By Mr. Elster) Okay. So I'll try to come at
15	it a different way.
16	So when you were program director and
17	subsequent to that, is it to the present, is it your
18	understanding that upon graduation or matriculation
19	there was always a summative evaluation created? The
20	instance well, is that right?
21	A. If the resident completed training, yes.
22	Q. Okay. But in the instances in which the
23	training was not completed there and the resident left
24	for other reasons, there was not necessarily a
25	summative evaluation created?

1	A. You're asking me my knowledge as the program
2	director?
3	Q. Correct.
4	A. At that time?
5	Q. Correct.
6	A. So sorry. What was the question?
7	Q. Okay.
8	A. When I was the program director.
9	Q. When you were the program director
10	A. Yes.
11	Q if someone did not complete the four-year
12	residency program?
13	A. Yes. It was not my understanding that there
14	was a summative evaluation that was needed.
15	Q. Okay. And in conjuncture with that
16	understanding would one be created if someone left?
17	MR. SULLIVAN: Object to form.
18	A. Well, so in Dr. Weisman's instance, once the
19	ACGME brought this requirement to our attention, we
20	created one.
21	Q. (By Mr. Elster) And that would have been
22	after September of 2021?
23	A. I believe so, yes.
24	Q. Okay. So he did not have one until sometime
25	after September of 2021?

1	A. Correct.
2	Well, he did not have what the ACGME considers
3	a summative evaluation, yes.
4	Q. Are you saying Washington University had what
5	they considered to be a summative evaluation?
6	A. Well, what we were using was a summary of his
7	progress along the milestones. Since he had left the
8	program early that's what we had thought would suffice
9	as a summative evaluation, was tracking his milestones
LO	before he left the program.
L1	Q. And the ACGME has since informed the
L2	department that that is not a summative evaluation?
L3	A. Correct.
L <b>4</b>	Q. When you were program director would residents
L5	sometimes transfer to Washington University?
L6	A. To Washington University?
L7	Q. Correct.
L8	A. I don't believe when I was program director I
L9	had anybody transfer into the program. I don't believe
20	so.
21	Q. What about transfer out?
22	A. So we we had a resident leave the program
23	because he felt anesthesiology was a poor fit, and we
24	had a resident that was fired. But I don't other
25	than those two instances, when I was program director I

1	can't recall residents transferring out.
2	Q. Okay. Or transferring in?
3	A. Yeah, I don't believe we had anybody transfer
4	in. Now, sometimes in when we do recruitment
5	through the ERAS system we'll sometimes take a resident
6	that may have done a year of training already, like an
7	internship, and then transferred directly into the
8	anesthesia training. It's possible that that occurred
9	when I was the program director but I don't recall.
LO	Q. Do you have an understanding of what type of
L1	documentation the department would need to effectuate
L2	an incoming transfer?
L3	A. Are you asking me as the program director did
L <b>4</b>	I know that?
L5	Q. Yeah. No, I'm asking yes. Yes.
L6	A. So as the program director, no, I don't think
L7	I had any idea what kind of documentation was required.
L8	Q. Independent of being the program director?
L9	A. Are you asking my knowledge now?
20	Q. Yes.
21	A. So, now, yes, I understand that there is
22	documentation required.
23	Q. And what is understanding of what's required?
24	A. I I think one of the things that they need
25	is a summative evaluation. That's due at the time that

the transfer is taking place. And there's probably
something else but that's the one that sticks in my
mind.
Q. So your understanding now is that the
department needs an ACGME summative evaluation to
accept a transfer in an anesthesiology resident.
A. The department needs a summative evaluation.
Q. A summative evaluation?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay.
A. At the time of transfer.
Q. At the time of transfer?
A. Right.
Q. Without that can they accept a resident?
A. I don't know specifically. I just know
that that my understanding is now that the
ACGME that is one of the things that the ACGME
requires, is a summative evaluation at the time of
transfer.
Q. A summative evaluation is is that something
that's defined by the ACGME?
A. I think the wording around what comprises a
summative evaluation by the ACGME is pretty nebulous.
But what we came up with is something similar to what
we would do if the resident had finished the program.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We try to speak to how they performed in those medical So medical knowledge, professionalism, competencies. etc., etc. What was the difference between what the ACGME 0. considered a summative evaluation and the milestones that were previously being provided? Α. Well, I guess the milestones, if you look at the actual form that the milestones are tracked on, it's really just sort of -- there's five columns and you're basically trying to place where the resident is on those five columns as they progress through training. And that -- for reasons that remain to be elucidated by the ACGME, if the ACGME didn't feel that that met the -- met the requirement. Are you familiar with any anesthesiology program in the United States that would take a resident from another anesthesiology program without a summative evaluation? I don't have knowledge about that one way or another. Similarly, are you aware of any anesthesiology program which would accept a transfer of a resident without any sort of transcripts or records from the prior institution? MR. SULLIVAN: Object to form.

1	A. I don't have knowledge one way or another but
2	that would seem unlikely.
3	Q. (By Mr. Elster) Why would it seem unlikely?
4	A. Well, I think any program would want to know,
5	you know, what it is that they're getting. What kind
6	of applicant they're getting and what kind of resident
7	they're getting.
8	Q. Okay. So, just so I'm certain, the first time
9	that a summative evaluation was created for Dr. Weisman
10	from Washington University was after September of 2021?
11	MR. SULLIVAN: Object to form.
12	Mischaracterizes his testimony.
13	Go ahead and answer.
14	A. I believe that that date matches, yes.
15	Q. (By Mr. Elster) Okay. Do you consider it a
16	mistake that there wasn't one created before that time
17	period?
18	MR. SULLIVAN: Object.
19	A. No, we didn't know the requirement.
20	Q. (By Mr. Elster) Okay.
21	A. And again, we don't usually have residents
22	leave so it's an unusual circumstance.
23	Q. Okay. Separate from your not knowing the
24	requirement, was it in compliance with ACGME
25	

1	A. It's hard to be in compliance with guidelines
2	if you don't know what the guidelines are.
3	Q. But aren't isn't Wash U. an ACGME an
4	accredited institute?
5	A. Sure.
6	Q. Okay.
7	A. That doesn't mean that every single
8	requirement that the ACGMe puts forth is met.
9	Q. Okay.
10	A. That's why they have reviews.
11	Q. So you think because you didn't know of the
12	specific requirement, it doesn't?
13	A. No, that's not what I said.
14	Q. Okay.
15	A. I said that the ACGME puts forth a lot of
16	rules and regulations. Just because your infraction of
17	one rule or regulation doesn't mean that you're not
18	going to be in compliance with the overall gestalt that
19	the ACGME is submitting, right? So if I have a
20	resident that breaks an IDL work week, that doesn't
21	mean that the ACGME is going to come down and say, oh,
22	you're no longer ACGME certified.
23	Q. And I'm not saying that they're going to pull
24	the certification based on that.
25	A. Okay.

Q. But do you agree with me that as you
understand it now that the failure to create a
summative evaluation before September of 2021 was a
violation of the
A As I understand it now, yes.
Q. It was a violation?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. You mentioned Tia Drake would have been
notified of that or communicated with someone at the
ACGME about that?
A. I believe that there was an ombudsman or a
lawyer or both from the ACGME that contacted Tia Drake,
yes.
Q. Do have an understanding of how this came on
their radar?
A. Because there was allegations that the program
was not being responsive to Dr. Weisman's request for
documentation.
Q. Was it common for you as when you were the
program director to communicate your opinions about
residents to other medical institutes?
MR. SULLIVAN: I'm going to object let
me just let me give me the time to insert
objections. Sometimes it's just just object. It
calls for speculation.

1	Go ahead and answer.
2	A. If your question is was it common, no, it's
3	not common.
4	Q. (By Mr. Elster) Did it happen?
5	A. Yes, it happened.
6	Q. In what types of instances?
7	A. Well, specifically with Dr. Weisman it
8	happened. I don't I don't recall an instance like
9	that as a program director. Certainly I fielded
10	inquiries from, you know, fellowship programs that were
11	asking about residents and whether they would, you
12	know, be good trainees as a fellow. I probably
13	entertained communications about, you know, whether or
14	not a resident would be a good employee in a practice
15	but I don't recall specific details.
16	Q. Okay. Do you believe that when you're
17	expressing your opinion and when you were the program
18	director that was that carried weight and was
19	valuable?
20	MR. SULLIVAN: Object to form. Calls for
21	speculation.
22	Go ahead and answer.
23	A. I don't know whether it carries weight or not.
24	Q. (By Mr. Elster) Okay. If you were
25	communicating with another program director when you

1	were program director and they gave a negative opinion
2	about a resident transferring in, would that be
3	important to you?
4	MR. SULLIVAN: I'm going to object. Improper
5	hypothetical.
6	Go ahead and answer.
7	A. I think it's unlikely. So I don't I don't
8	recall any specific instances where I called a
9	resident another residency program director
10	inquiring about a resident. But I think it would be
11	unlikely for a residency program not to try to color a
12	resident in the most positive light possible.
13	Q. (By Mr. Elster) You're saying it's unlikely
14	that that would happen?
15	A. Yeah.
16	Q. Okay. If if another residency program
17	director communicated to you there were significant red
18	flags around a resident, would you take that resident
19	transfer?
20	MR. SULLIVAN: Object to form. Calls for
21	speculation. Improper hypothetical.
22	Go ahead and answer.
23	A. It depends on what their concerns were.
24	Q. (By Mr. Elster) Okay. If that's all they
25	said was red flags.

1	A. It would be unlikely that they would leave the
2	conversation like that.
3	Q. Well, what if they did, how would you what
4	would you do?
5	A. If they told me that there was red flags, I
6	would be concerned. Sure.
7	Q. Okay. Why?
8	A. Well, I mean, for one, I would want to know
9	what the red flags are. For two, you worry about
10	whether or not the resident's going to be able to
11	complete training.
12	Q. It would call into question the resident's
13	competence and capabilities?
14	MR. SULLIVAN: Object to form. Calls for
15	speculation.
16	Go ahead and answer.
17	A. So for me it just it calls into question
18	whether or not they're going to be able to complete the
19	training of the program.
20	Q. (By Mr. Elster) What if a residency director
21	told you just say no with respect to a resident?
22	MR. SULLIVAN: Object to form. Calls for
23	speculation. Improper hypothetical.
24	Go ahead and answer.
25	A. It would be very unlikely for another

1	residency program director to say that.
2	Q. (By Mr. Elster) Okay. And I'm asking if that
3	happened, would you take that resident?
4	A. It depends.
5	Q. Okay. If that's all they said, just say no?
6	A. Again, in real life it's unlikely that that
7	would happen. If it did, it would depend.
8	Q. Okay. Do you know if Dr. Evers said that to
9	someone at Yale about Dr. Weisman?
LO	A. I have no idea what Dr. Evers said.
L1	Q. Okay. Similarly, if a residency director
L2	communicates to you about a perspective transferring
L3	resident, read between the lines, that's all they said,
L <b>4</b>	how would you interpret that?
L5	MR. SULLIVAN: I'm going to object to form.
L6	Improper hypothetical. Calls for speculation.
L7	Go ahead and answer.
L8	A. So as the residency program director, I do not
L9	recall any instances where I received a call from
20	another program director telling me about a resident
21	that wanted to transfer into the program.
22	Q. (By Mr. Elster) And you told me that. But
23	I'm saying what would have been your reaction if you
24	were the program director and another program director
25	communicated to you, quote, read between the lines?

1	MR. SULLIVAN: Same
2	Q. (By Mr. Elster) About this resident?
3	MR. SULLIVAN: Same objection.
4	Go ahead and answer.
5	A. Again, it would depend on what the concerns
6	are.
7	Q. (By Mr. Elster) And if there was nothing more
8	voiced beyond that?
9	A. If there was nothing more voiced beyond that,
10	then yeah, I would have trepidations about accepting
11	the resident.
12	Q. What is diversion in the anesthesiology
13	context?
14	A. Diversion usually refers to taking drugs away
15	from their intended purpose, which is usually given to
16	a patient, and using it for personal use.
17	Q. To your understanding is that a problem in the
18	practice of anesthesiology?
19	A. Yeah. Yes.
20	Q. Okay. Why do you say yes?
21	A. Because I think that's fairly well known.
22	Q. If there was a suggestion that a potential
23	resident I guess it would be called diverting was
24	diverting drugs, would you take that potential
25	perspective resident as you were the program director?

1	MR. SULLIVAN: I'm going to object to form.
2	Calls for speculation and improper hypothetical.
3	Go ahead and answer.
4	A. If is your question if I had information or
5	was led to believe that there was a resident diverting
6	drugs, would I have concerns about accepting the
7	resident?
8	Q. (By Mr. Elster) Right.
9	A. Yes.
10	Q. Is there a situation when you would accept
11	such a resident if you were certain about him diverting
12	drugs or her?
13	MR. SULLIVAN: Objection. Calls for
14	speculation. Improper hypothetical.
15	Go ahead and answer.
16	A. It would depend. So, you know, there are
17	residents that are successfully rehabilitated from
18	illicit drug use. Unfortunately, our discipline has a
19	high rate of recidivism. So it would depend on the
20	particulars.
21	Q. (By Mr. Elster) Do you know who Dr. Alan Kaye
22	is?
23	A. I know the name. I don't believe I've ever
24	met Dr. Kaye. I don't know him personally.
25	Q. Have you ever spoken to him?

1	A. I don't believe I've ever spoken to Dr. Kaye,
2	no.
3	Q. Okay. Have you ever communicated with him in
4	writing?
5	A. I have e-mailed him, yes.
6	Q. What do you remember about those?
7	A. I believe I forwarded a letter of
8	recommendation on behalf of Dr. Weisman. I may have
9	forwarded something else as well.
10	Q. What's the something else?
11	A. I don't recall. I might have forwarded a
12	rotation schedule but I don't recall.
13	Q. Outside of those communications, any other
14	interactions with Dr. Kaye?
15	A. I don't believe so.
16	Q. Do you know anything about his background?
17	A. I believe he is the chair of the department
18	but, no, I don't know anything about his background.
19	Q. Okay. Are you familiar that's he's written an
20	expert report in this case?
21	A. In what case?
22	Q. In this particular this case that we're
23	here on today for your deposition.
24	A. No, did not know that.
25	Q. Okay. So you don't know if he gave a number

1 of -- you don't know whether or not he gave a number of 2 opinions in an expert report? 3 Α. No. I want to ask you about some of his 4 Okay. 0. He gave an opinion that anesthesiologists 5 approximately make around the United States half a 6 million dollars, \$750,000 as a board certified 7 8 anesthesiologist. Do you agree with that opinion? 9 That seems a little high. Α. 10 What range would you give? Q. 11 There's a difference in pay Α. So it depends. 12 scale if you're an academic, such as myself, or if 13 you're in what we call private practice. If you're in 14 private practice, that pay range might be more 15 realistic. But if you're in academics, I would -without knowing particulars, I would guess you'd be 16 17 more in the range of 250- to 400,000. Unless maybe if 18 you're in a position like a chair, maybe that would be 19 half a million. 20 Private practice, do you have an opinion on 21 what a pay range would be? 22 It might be similar to what Dr. Kaye is Α. 23 saying, 500- to 750-. 24 So you would agree with his opinion as to the Q. 25 range of compensation as it relates to private

prostigo?
practice?
A. Without knowing particulars if you're asking
my opinion?
Q. Right.
A. That sounds about right, yes.
Q. Okay. But less if there was an academic
academic settings make less?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. Do you know what Strategic Biomedical,
Inc., is?
A. No.
Q. Do you know if that was a lab that Jeff Dr.
Weisman operated while at Washington University?
A. I don't know what it is so I don't know.
Q. Have you ever heard of that before?
A. I have not.
Q. Do you know if he ever had a lab?
A. I know he had a lab, yes.
Q. And what do you know about that?
A. So as the program director I don't think I
knew anything about it. But subsequently I believe it
was a lab that had to do with 3D printing.
Q. How did you come to that understanding?
A. Some of the documents that I was given to
review.

1	Q. Outside of reading those documents did you
2	have any other way of knowing that?
3	A. Outside of those documents, no, I don't
4	believe so.
5	Q. Okay. Dr. Kaye gave an additional opinion. I
6	want to read it to you. It says, quote, My overall
7	opinion in this matter is that it was unreasonable for
8	the program referring to Washington University to
9	expect Dr. Weisman to perform all of his obligations as
10	a resident physician of training while simultaneously
11	running and operating his lab, close quote. Do you
12	agree with his opinion?
13	MR. SULLIVAN: Object to form.
14	Go ahead and answer.
15	A. The way I interpret that statement is that
16	it's his opinion that we would ask someone to run a lab
17	and to complete clinical training. So if his statement
18	is speaking to, you know, having a lot of demands on
19	your time, I can see that being factual.
20	Q. (By Mr. Elster) So if it's what do you
21	mean you can see that being factual? I don't follow
22	you.
23	A. Well, I guess what I'm trying to say is that
24	as a residency program director we would not require
25	someone to run a lab. It wouldn't be it wouldn't be

1	something that we would recommend, for someone to run a
2	lab and try to complete a residency training program.
3	Just like we wouldn't advocate for somebody to have a
4	second job and try to complete a residency training
5	program.
6	Q. If someone is operating a research lab do you
7	think that the department had any responsibilities to
8	accommodate that?
9	MR. SULLIVAN: Object to form. Calls for
10	speculation.
11	Go ahead and answer.
12	A. I believe the residency program's obligation
13	is to try to produce a clinically competent
14	anesthesiologist when they're done with their training.
15	Anything that interferes with that should be taken into
16	consideration.
17	Q. (By Mr. Elster) To what extent to be taken
18	into consideration?
19	A. So if you're asking for my opinion.
20	Q. Yeah.
21	A. It would be that you need to focus on your
22	clinical training and put aside other considerations.
23	Q. Dr. Kaye also gave an opinion, quote, Dr.
24	Weisman's research experience, expertise, and his M.D.
25	slash Ph.D. status, makes him a highly competitive

candidate to all residency training programs, close
quote. Do you agree with that?
A. Can you read that again?
Q. Quote, Dr. Weisman's research experience,
expertise, and his M.D. slash Ph.D. status makes him a
highly competitive candidate to all residency training
programs, close quote.
A. So are you asking me to answer that question
with the knowledge that I have about Dr. Weisman's
clinical performance?
Q. So I'll ask that subsequently to that.
So do you agree with just that statement
specifically?
A. No, not necessarily.
Q. Okay. Why not necessarily?
A. Because there's other things that you should
take into consideration besides someone's academic
pedigree.
Q. Do you think his academic academic pedigree
just in and of itself makes him a highly competitive
candidate?
A. Not necessarily.
Q. In the case of Dr. Weisman do you think that
his academic pedigree pedigree is an asset in terms
of being going into another residency training

1	program?
2	A. It depends on what kind of training he's
3	trying to complete.
4	Q. Another anesthesiology program?
5	A. Does his academic pedigree mean that he's well
6	qualified to go into another anesthesiology program?
7	Q. Correct.
8	A. No, I don't agree with that.
9	Q. Does that make him a highly competitive
10	candidate?
11	A. If all I knew about somebody was their
12	degrees?
13	Q. Correct.
14	A. Does that mean that they're going to be a
15	well-qualified anesthesiologist or a competitive
16	applicant?
17	Q. Correct.
18	A. No.
19	Q. That's the question.
20	A. No.
21	Q. What else what else do you need?
22	A. So other things that I would want to look at
23	is where were the degrees completed. What was his
24	clinical performance while he was in medical school.
25	Some of those things we can get from the dean's letter.
	j li

1	If he did away rotations, how did he do on those
2	rotations. And if he did he or she did an
3	anesthesia rotation, how did they do on that rotation?
4	Q. Dr. Kaye gave a number of further opinions.
5	Before we take a break I want to ask you about one more
6	of them.
7	Quote, An ACGME's accredited program's purpose
8	and their duty is to provide training and fair learning
9	opportunities to its resident physicians, close quote.
10	A. Can you read it one more time?
11	Q. "An ACGME accredited program's purpose and
12	their duty is to provide training and fair learning
13	opportunities to its resident professions."
14	A. I agree with that.
15	Q. Close quote.
16	A. I agree with that.
17	Q. Do you know if that happened with Dr. Weisman?
18	A. Well, you're excuse me. You're asking me
19	to assume the perspective of Dr. Weisman, which is
20	impossible for me to do. I can't speak to whether or
21	not he felt his experience was fair or not.
22	Q. Okay. Well, I'm asking you do you feel his
23	experience was fair?
24	A. To my knowledge, yes.
25	Q. Okay. Based on any of your personal

1	interactions, do you know?
2	A. Based on my personal interactions with who?
3	Q. With Dr. Weisman while he was a resident.
4	MR. SULLIVAN: Object to form. Vague,
5	confusing.
6	Go ahead and answer.
7	A. I I don't recall any conversations with Dr.
8	Weisman where he would have led me to believe
9	otherwise, that he didn't feel like he was being
10	treated fairly.
11	Q. (By Mr. Elster) How many times have you
12	spoken to him that you can recall?
13	A. Probably on the order of 10 times.
14	Q. Okay. No more than that though over the
15	course of all these years?
16	A. Well, you're asking about things that took
17	place four or five years ago. So it's a conjecture on
18	my part. I don't recall specifically but on the order
19	of 10.
20	MR. ELSTER: Okay. Let's take a break here.
21	VIDEOGRAPHER: We're off the record at 10:21
22	a.m.
23	(Short break.)
24	VIDEOGRAPHER: Go back on the record at 10:45
25	a.m.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. (By Mr. Elster) The next opinion from Dr. Kaye I want to ask you about, Dr. Thompson, I'll quote it. So begin quote, At an ACGME accredited residency training program the evaluation process should be objective and should not be motivated by harassment, retaliation, or performed in an effort to pressure a resident physician to resign, close quote. Do you agree with that opinion? I agree that the evaluations should be done without harassment or trying to pressure someone to I believe that's correct. The question about resign. objectivity though I think is more difficult. What makes it more difficult? 0. Α. Well, so, for example, if you, you know, outside of medicine, if you had 10 different individuals witness some particular event then asked them to recall the event, you might have 10 different recollections of how that went down. And I think that there are parallels to observing someone's clinical performance. You know, in the case of anesthesiology, I could watch a resident do an incredibly simple case and think that -- for that particular case for that particular patient they did fine. But on a different day if I'm supervising a resident doing a more complex

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

case, I might feel very differently. That they're performance is subpar. Are there any objective components to the evaluation process? There are things that can be objective, sure. Α. Like what? 0. Α. Well, so for example, if you wanted to evaluate a resident's ability to intubate a patient, place a breathing tube, you know, the objective criteria you might use is did they get it in the right place or not. But that ignores, you know, how they accomplish that, right? Because you can also knock out somebody's tooth while trying to place the breathing tube, and I think that also needs to be taken into consideration when you evaluate someone. Do you think that the evaluation process is 0. more subjective or objective? You're asking me to weigh objectivity versus subjectivity. I don't know how I would do that. 0. You don't have a belief one way or the other as to gauge a resident's progress? I think both subjective criteria and objective criteria fit into the -- into the evaluation process. So you would disagree with Dr. Kaye's opinion 0. that the evaluation process should be -- should be

1	objective?
2	A. Yeah, I think I would disagree with that.
3	Q. You're saying that in part in part because
4	you're saying it should be partially be subjective?
5	A. Well, I think in in reality part of it is
6	subjective, yes.
7	Q. Dr. Kaye also gave an opinion that, quote, It
8	was also a violation of industry standards in ACGME
9	procedures to refuse to show Dr. Weisman his evaluation
10	scores, close quote.
11	MR. SULLIVAN: Going to object to form. Lacks
12	foundation.
13	Go ahead and answer.
14	A. To my knowledge Dr. Weisman had access to his
15	files so I'm not sure what that's in reference to.
16	Q. (By Mr. Elster) Okay. Do you believe that
17	Dr. Weisman should have had that access to his
18	evaluation scores?
19	A. Yes, he should have had access to evaluation
20	scores.
21	Q. At what periods of time?
22	A. While he was there as a resident?
23	Q. At all periods of time while he was a
24	resident?
25	A. He should have had access to it, yes.

1	Q. If he did not have access to his evaluation
2	scores, do you think that would have been a violation
3	of ACGME procedures?
4	MR. SULLIVAN: I'm going to object to form. It
5	assumes facts not in evidence. It's contrary to the
6	facts in evidence. Calls for speculation.
7	Go ahead and answer.
8	A. Am I supposed to answer it?
9	MR. SULLIVAN: Yeah.
10	A. Sorry. Can you repeat the question? If he
11	had not had access?
12	Q. (By Mr. Elster) If he did not have access,
13	would that have been a violation?
14	A. If that is in fact true, yeah, I think that
15	would probably be a violation.
16	(Discussion held off the record.)
17	Q. (By Mr. Elster) Are you familiar with
18	generally with the consortium between Washington
19	University and Barnes Jewish Hospital?
20	A. I don't know the specifics. But, yeah, I know
21	there's a consortium.
22	Q. Not necessarily the bylaws. Okay.
23	Likewise, if Dr. Weisman didn't have access to
24	his evaluations and how they were scored, would it be a
25	violation of those consortium policies?

1	MR. SULLIVAN: And I'll object to the
2	question. Assumes facts not in evidence. Contrary to
3	the facts in evidence. Calls for speculation.
4	Go ahead and answer.
5	A. I'm not sure how that would be pertinent to
6	the consortium but I don't know one way or another.
7	Q. (By Mr. Elster) Would it have violated any
8	Washington University policies?
9	MR. SULLIVAN: Same objection.
10	Go ahead and answer.
11	A. I I don't know.
12	Q. (By Mr. Elster) Okay. Isn't it important
13	that a resident has access to his or her training
14	scores
15	A Yes.
16	Q. Why?
17	A. So they know how they're doing in the program.
18	Q. Okay. And if they don't have access to that,
19	would that be problematic?
20	A. I believe that would be problematic, yes.
21	Q. In what way?
22	A. Well, other than my belief that it's an ACGME
23	requirement that they be able to access their files,
24	you wouldn't want to be in a situation where the
25	resident is somehow surprised or taken back by what

1	their evaluations are.
2	Q. Okay. Have you ever refused to release any of
3	Dr. Weisman's files from Washington University to
4	any to him?
5	MR. SULLIVAN: Going to object to form.
6	Vague.
7	Go ahead and answer.
8	A. Have I ever refused? I'm sorry, what was the
9	question?
10	Q. (By Mr. Elster) Have you ever refused to
11	release Dr. Weisman's files or records from his time as
12	an anesthesiology resident at Washington University to
13	him?
14	MR. SULLIVAN: Same objection.
15	Go ahead and answer.
16	A. There was supposedly a request from somebody
17	to copy or fax his entire file, which I didn't feel was
18	a good use of resources so I did refuse that request.
19	Q. (By Mr. Elster) And I'll ask about that next.
20	But the first question was to him. Did you ever refuse
21	to release it to him?
22	A. Did I ever refuse to release files to him?
23	Not to my knowledge, no.
24	Q. What are you referring to that it wasn't a
25	good use of resources not to release it to somebody

1 else? Well, I mean, his file is probably thicker 2 3 than that file there, so it's just not a good use of 4 admin resources to fax or copy an entire file to that. There's no utility to that. If there's specific things 5 that, you know, are being asked about, so for example 6 7 milestones or, you know, a list of rotations that he had taken or, you know, meeting notes, I think that's 8 9 reasonable. But to come up with a blanket request that 10 I ask somebody to photocopy 200 pages doesn't seem like a good resource allocation. 11 12 Who was it that requested the file that you're 13 referring to? 14 I believe it was Dr. Patil, P-a-t-i-l. 15 believe. But I could be wrong. 16 And you thought it was onerous to copy 200 0. 17 pages? 18 I thought it was onerous to ask one of our 19 admins to do that, yes. 20 0. How long would that have taken? 21 I don't know. I didn't ask her to do it. Α. 22 Have you ever copied paper before? **Q.** 23 Not 200 pages. Α. 24 Q. Okay. You don't -- you don't think it would 25 take less than 10 minutes to do that?

1	A. I don't think it would take less than 10
2	minutes, no.
3	Q. Okay. So you refused to release the
4	transcript to Dr or his file to Dr. Patil because
5	it was too much of a time commitment to copy it; is
6	that right?
7	MR. SULLIVAN: I'm going to object.
8	Go ahead and answer.
9	A. Correct.
10	Q. (By Mr. Elster) Okay. You didn't feel that
11	you had an obligation to release his file to Dr. Patil
12	when asked?
13	A. I didn't feel the request was reasonable.
14	Q. Well, so what would have been reasonable?
15	Correct me if I'm wrong, if certain portions were
16	copied?
17	A. If there was a specific question that was
18	being put to the program that I could answer by
19	submitting documents, I would have been happy to do
20	that. But a blanket request to photocopy an entire
21	file doesn't seen reasonable nor am I sure what that
22	would have accomplished.
23	Q. Okay.
24	A. Also, I seriously doubt that anyone would have
25	read through an entire file of consisting of 200

1	pages or more.
2	Q. Are you just guessing at that though?
3	A. I'm guessing at that, yeah.
4	Q. So as an alternative you wanted to selectively
5	produce some of the 200 pages?
6	MR. SULLIVAN: I'm going to object to form.
7	Mischaracterizes his testimony.
8	Go ahead and answer.
9	A. I don't believe there was any subsequent
10	request for specific documents.
11	Q. (By Mr. Elster) Okay. But if they had
12	requested specific documents would you have told
13	someone in admin to go through and pluck out those
14	specific documents?
15	A. Yeah, if it was a reasonable request, sure.
16	Q. Okay. So you thought it was less burdensome
17	to have someone go through and selectively pick certain
18	things as opposed to just copy 200 pages; is that
19	A Well, a lot of the documents are
20	electronically filed so I don't think it would have
21	been that onerous to search for whatever documents
22	might have been requested.
23	Q. Okay. Did you communicate to Dr. Patil that
24	you weren't going to release the records because it was
25	too much of an administrative burden?

	A. No. I believe I communicated that with Dr.
Weism	nan though. I don't believe I communicated that
with	Dr. Patil.
	Q. When did you communicate that to Dr. Weisman?
	A. I don't recall specifically. It was probably
somet	ime after I got the request.
	Q. And after you had made the decision it was too
much	of an administrative burden?
	A. Yes.
	Q. Was it your decision alone that it was too
much	of an administrative burden to copy 200 pages?
	A. Assuming that I was the program director at
the t	ime, yeah, it would have been my decision.
	Q. Were you not the program director at the time?
	A. I don't remember when the request was made.
	Q. You talked to Dr. Patil at around that time
perio	od. What did you communicate to Dr. Patil?
	A. I don't believe I spoke with her. I
commu	nicated with her.
	Q. What did you communicate?
	A. What did I communicate?
	Q. Correct.
	A. I believe I had a request from Dr. Weisman to
send	her documents, particular documents. One of them
might	have been a letter and it might have been a

1	rotation schedule. I don't recall the specifics. I
2	did try to fulfill that request. When I sent her the
3	e-mail, it bounced back immediately. And I don't
4	remember any further communication after that.
5	Q. So you tried to send a rotation schedule or?
6	A. I don't remember the particulars of what I
7	sent her. I do know that I sent her some documents but
8	I don't know if they ever reached her because, again,
9	the e-mail that I sent bounced back.
10	Q. Why did you pick the documents that you
11	sent sent out?
12	A. Presumably because that's what I was requested
13	to send.
14	Q. But you do remember that you were requested to
15	send the entire file from Dr. Patil?
16	A. I remember receiving that request from Dr.
17	Weisman, yes, not from Dr. Patil.
18	Q. So Dr. Weisman requested the entire file?
19	A. I believe that is correct, yes.
20	Q. And that's you refused to give it to him
21	because it was too much of a burden?
22	A. Correct.
23	There was nothing precluding Dr. Weisman from
24	making a copy of it himself had he come to the office.
25	Q. Did you ever offer to scan it for him?

1	A. I don't believe we offered to scan it for him,
2	no.
3	Q. Did you ever offer to put it on a thumb drive
4	for him?
5	A. No.
6	Q. Okay. Isn't there a lot of paperwork
7	associated with medical treatment and care?
8	A. There's a lot of electronic records that are
9	associated with medical treatment and care, yes.
10	Q. Was there not an electronic record of these
11	documents, the 200 pages?
12	A. I don't believe his entire file would be
13	electronic, no. We don't routinely put things like
14	medical school, applications, or test scores
15	electronically. But that stuff would probably have a
16	paper copy in the file.
17	Q. Okay. Did you just not want to assist him in
18	making it or you didn't you didn't feel any
19	anything compelling you to assist him by making a copy
20	of 200 pages?
21	MR. SULLIVAN: I'm going to object.
22	Argumentative.
23	Go ahead and answer.
24	A. I didn't see the utility to the request.
25	Q. (By Mr. Elster) From your perspective

1	utility?
2	A. From my perspective as a program director,
3	correct.
4	Q. What about the utility to Dr. Weisman,
5	wouldn't that have been useful to him?
6	A. I don't know. I didn't know what the nature
7	of the request was.
8	Q. Didn't didn't you think that you didn't
9	know that he was trying to get into other residency
10	programs?
11	A. I knew he was applying for an occupational
12	health residency but I'm not sure when I became aware
13	of that.
14	Q. How did you know that?
15	A. I think I first became aware of that because
16	the ERAS System notified me that a letter that had been
17	written on his behalf was being sent to a residency
18	program.
19	Q. So the is the ERAS System, that's
20	essentially it's for residency applications?
21	A. Correct. If they're going through the match,
22	correct.
23	Q. Okay. And you received a notification that he
24	was attempting to get into other residency programs; is
25	that right?

1	A. Correct.
2	Q. Do you know which one it was?
3	A. Which specific program?
4	Q. Right.
5	A. No.
6	Q. You just knew generally he was trying to get
7	into programs?
8	A. Correct. But if my memory is correct I
9	believe it was an occupational health residency
10	program. But where, I don't I don't know that I
11	knew that.
12	Q. So would it be a fair statement at the time
13	you declined to provide a copy of the file to him you
14	knew he was trying to get into other residency training
15	programs?
16	MR. SULLIVAN: Object to form.
17	Mischaracterizes his testimony.
18	Go ahead and answer.
19	A. I don't recall the temporal relation between
20	those two events. So in other words, I don't recall
21	when that request was made in relation to when I
22	discovered he was applying for other residency
23	programs.
24	Q. (By Mr. Elster) You would have gotten an
25	e-mail from the ERAS System saying he was looking

1	indicating that he was looking because there was a
2	recommendation letter?
3	A. The notification from ERAS was that he was
4	using a letter that I believe either I or Dr. Benzinger
5	wrote for him and that letter was being sent to other
6	programs.
7	Q. Okay. So it only notifies you when the letter
8	from the department is utilized?
9	A. I think it only notifies us if there's a
10	letter that's submitted to a ERAS that's being used.
11	So in other words, if he had a letter written outside
12	of that system and he was using it, I don't know that
13	I'd be notified.
14	Q. Okay. Do you recall when the communications
15	with Dr. Patil occurred?
16	A. I don't.
17	Q. And there was none of it was by telephone;
18	is that right?
19	A. I don't believe I ever spoke with Dr. Patil by
20	phone, no.
21	Q. Okay. Has anyone else other than Dr. Weisman
22	requested a copy of his or her file from Washington
23	University?
24	MR. SULLIVAN: Object to form. Vague.
25	Go ahead and answer if you can.

1	A. So is your question has anyone ever reached
2	out to me directly other that Dr. Weisman?
3	Q. (By Mr. Elster) Right.
4	A. I don't remember.
5	Q. Do you know of anyone else reaching out to
6	someone other than you for a copy of the residency file
7	from Washington University?
8	A. Say that again.
9	Q. We talked before about how Dr. Weisman asked
10	you for a copy of the his training records.
11	A. Uh-huh.
12	Q. Has anyone other than Dr. Weisman made such a
13	request, not necessarily to you but that you're aware
14	of?
15	MR. SULLIVAN: Object to form. Assumes facts
16	not in evidence.
17	Go ahead and answer.
18	A. The requests that I recall for his file came
19	from Dr. Weisman. I don't recall a third party
20	directly asking me.
21	Q. (By Mr. Elster) And my question was a little
22	different. My question was has any other resident made
23	a request like Dr. Weisman did?
24	A. I understand. Sorry.
25	While I was the program director. The most

common request that I get would be for a training
verification, which is usually a condition of
employment.
Q. What's a training verification?
A. It's pretty self-explanatory. It's just
asking the residency program director to verify that
that particular program attended the residency program
and that they completed the program.
Q. Okay. Would there ever have been a training
verification for Dr. Weisman?
A. I believe there was something along those
lines. I'm not sure if it was a residency I'm not
sure if it was a training verification program but it
was something like that.
Q. Okay. Do you know if you would have sent that
to Dr. Patil?
A. I don't believe I sent that to Dr. Patil,
no.
Q. You said it's a condition of employment; is
that right?
A. The residency training verification, yes, is a
condition of employment.
Q. Why?
A. Well, because as an employer you want to know
that the person completed their residency program

1	before you employ them.
2	Q. Okay. Would that have been the training
3	verification, or whatever it was for Dr. Weisman, would
4	that have been a component of his 200 pages or so file
5	that you declined to copy?
6	MR. SULLIVAN: Object to form.
7	Go ahead and answer.
8	A. No, it wouldn't have been part of his file.
9	The same way that a training verification form wouldn't
10	be part of a resident's file that completed training
11	there. Those requests come from whoever the employer
12	is to the program. So it's not a preexisting form that
13	we would have.
14	Q. (By Mr. Elster) Something created in
15	response?
16	A. Correct.
17	Q. Did you ever condition the release of Dr.
18	Weisman's training file and I'm referring is that
19	the correct terminology for the 200 pages we're talking
20	about, training file, just so we're talking about the
21	same?
22	A. It's as good as anything I can think of.
23	Q. Did you ever condition that on him signing a
24	release of liability?
25	MR. SULLIVAN: I'll object.

1	A. No.
2	MR. SULLIVAN: Calls for a legal conclusion.
3	Go ahead and answer.
4	A. No. There was a request for a letter of
5	recommendation for Dr. Weisman that I had asked for
6	for his signature stating something along the lines
7	that he hadn't looked at the letter. But there was
8	never any conditionality.
9	Q. (By Mr. Elster) Did you ever ask Dr. Weisman
10	to sign a release of liability for you and Washington
11	University?
12	A. I don't believe so, no.
13	Q. Do you think that's something you would have
14	ever done?
15	A. A release of liability. Unless it's in the
16	context of the letter of recommendation that I just
17	referenced, no, I don't think we would have ever asked
18	him to sign something like that.
19	Q. As program director do you think it would have
20	been appropriate for you to condition the release of
21	his training file on him signing a release of
22	liability?
23	MR. SULLIVAN: I'm going to object to form.
24	Assumes facts not in evidence. Contrary to the facts
25	in evidence.

_	
1	Go ahead and answer.
2	A. Would I have asked for him to sign a release
3	of liability before releasing records. Is that your
4	question?
5	Q. (By Mr. Elster) Correct.
6	A. No, I don't believe so.
7	Q. What about a release of records to any third
8	parties?
9	MR. SULLIVAN: Same objection.
10	Go ahead.
11	A. A release of records to any third parties. I
12	don't believe so.
13	Q. (By Mr. Elster) Jump around to Exhibit 20.
14	MR. ELSTER: I have copies for everyone too.
15	MR. SULLIVAN: Okay.
16	MS. RUTTER: You said Exhibit 20, Henry?
17	MR. ELSTER: Yeah, Exhibit 20.
18	And I think the Bates label is 59188. I
19	guess I don't think it's consecutive. That's the
20	first one. Mark this Exhibit 20.
21	Q. (By Mr. Elster) What is Exhibit 20, Dr.
22	Thompson?
23	A. It looks like an e-mail.
24	Q. Is this an e-mail that you sent to Dr. Weisman
25	on November 26 of 2018?

1	A. It would appear that way.
2	Q. Would you have been the training or the
3	department?
4	A. The residency program director.
5	Q. The residency program director?
6	A. Yes.
7	Q. At that time?
8	Okay. Is your e-mail drthompson@wustl.edu?
9	A. It is.
10	Q. Do you have any other e-mail addresses?
11	A. Sure.
12	Q. What are they?
13	A. Drthompson911@yahoo.
14	Q. Anything other than that Yahoo address?
15	A. Drthomps99@gmail.
16	Q. Anything Else?
17	A. Douglasroycethompson@yahoo.
18	Q. Is that all of them? I just want to make sure
19	I got all of your e-mails.
20	A. I think that's all of them.
21	Q. Okay. Have you ever communicated about Dr.
22	Weisman on those e-mail addresses?
23	A. Other than the wustl account?
24	Q. Correct.
25	A. I don't believe so.

1	Q.	Have you ever text messaged about Dr. Weisman?
2	A.	Have I text messaged about Dr. Weisman. I
3	don't kno	ow.
4	Q.	Would there have been any other written
5	communica	ations about Dr. Weisman other than text
6	messages	and e-mails?
7	A.	Like letters?
8	Q.	Sure.
9	A.	Other than in the context of sending records,
10	no, I do	n't believe so.
11	Q.	Records to third parties?
12	A.	Records to third parties or requests for
13	informat:	ion.
14	Q.	What type of request for information?
15	A.	Well, I I know that there was a request for
16	me to hav	we a telephone conversation with someone
17	regarding	g him.
18	Q.	Who was that person?
19	A.	I believe that was Dr. Epling at Duke.
20	Q.	At Duke. Okay. Did you have that telephone
21	call?	
22	A.	I did not.
23	Q.	Why didn't you?
24	A.	That was on the advice of counsel from BJH and
25	BJC.	

Q. Did you communicate to Dr. Epling that you
couldn't communicate because it was on the advice of
counsel?
A. I did.
Q. Okay. The first page of the e-mail, this
is is this the e-mail from you to Dr. Weisman again?
A. This is an excerpt of what I believe is a
longer e-mail exchange. But yes, this is an e-mail
from me to Dr. Weisman.
Q. And there's an authorization of a release that
was attached on page 2.
A. Uh-huh.
Q. Who prepared this authorization and release?
A. I don't know.
Q. Did you prepare it?
A. No.
Q. Was it provided to you by an attorney?
MR. SULLIVAN: I'm going to object and
instruct you not to disclose any attorney-client
communications. To the extent you can answer the
question, you can go ahead
A. I have no idea who prepared this. I
yeah.
Q. (By Mr. Elster) Have you ever asked someone
other than Dr. Weisman during your tenure at Washington

1	University to sign an authorization and release like
2	what we see in Exhibit 20?
3	A. Well, having never encountered a case like Dr.
4	Weisman, no, there wouldn't have been occasion to.
5	Q. You said you never encountered a case like Dr.
6	Weisman. Okay. What?
7	A. Someone that left the program in the way that
8	Dr. Weisman did.
9	Q. I don't want was there an attorney who
10	prepared this authorization and release?
11	MR. SULLIVAN: I'm going to again object. I
12	think it's asked and answered. And further direct the
13	witness not to disclose any attorney-client
14	communications.
15	And subject to that you can answer.
16	A. I I don't know who prepared that.
17	Q. (By Mr. Elster) Do you know who provided it
18	to you?
19	A. I do not out of context know who provided it
20	to me, no.
21	Q. Would there have been people when you were in
22	this position in 2018 who would have prepared a
23	document like this?
24	MR. SULLIVAN: Object to form. Asked and
25	answered.

Q. (By Mr. Elster) I'm trying to narrow down who
would have created this. Because if you don't the
specific names, I'm like, well, who could it have been?
That's what I'm tying to do.
A. So I do not know specific names, so I can't
answer that question.
Q. So this is dated November of 2018?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. Where temporally did you make the
determination that it was too much of an administrative
burden to copy his training file?
A. I don't know. I would have to see that
e-mail.
Q. Okay. You don't know if it was before or
after this e-mail?
A. I don't know.
Q. Okay. Do you know if Dr. Weisman ever signed
this authorization and release?
A. I am fairly certain he never did.
Q. Okay. Did you see earlier drafts of this
authorization and release?
MR. SULLIVAN: I'm going to
Q. (By Mr. Elster) Before this version here?
MR. SULLIVAN: I'm just going to object and
caution the witness not to disclose any attorney-client

1	communications, if there were.
2	Go ahead and answer.
3	A. I don't recall seeing any earlier drafts of
4	this, if that's what you're referring to.
5	Q. (By Mr. Elster) Before it was sent?
6	A. I don't recall.
7	Q. And I don't want to talk about any
8	communications, but is there an attorney who would
9	you would consult with about legal liability for
10	residency? I just want an identity, not
11	communications.
12	A. If you're asking if I have a legal question?
13	Q. Right.
14	A. Is there somebody that I would go to at Wash
15	U. or BJC?
16	Q. Correct.
17	A. So I would usually direct a question like that
18	to Christine Ramatowski or Joe Sklansky.
19	Q. Okay. With that in mind, does that make it
20	probable that one or one or both of them prepared
21	this authorization and release?
22	MR. SULLIVAN: I'm going to object. Instruct
23	the witness not to disclose any attorney-client
24	communications.
25	A. It's possible.

Q. (By Mr. Elster) Okay. Before you sent the
e-mail did you or immediately before you sent the
e-mail, I know you don't remember if you saw earlier
drafts, but did you look at the language in the
release?
A. No.
Q. So you didn't know before you sent it that it
was asking to release you, Washington University,
Barnes-Jewish Hospital, so on and so forth from any
liability?
MR. SULLIVAN: And I'm going to object to the
form, that it mischaracterizes this authorization and
release.
Q. (By Mr. Elster) Outside of what you said
before in terms of your personal involvement, have you
ever heard of Washington University asking someone to
sign a release like this in connection with the release
of their training file?
A. I don't know how I would know that.
Q. Because you've worked there for years and you
might have some knowledge of it. I don't know.
A. No, I don't know how I would know that because
this would be privileged and confidential. So how
would I know that?
Q. From communicating with nonattorneys?

1	A. No.
2	Q. Do you know if his training file was ever
3	released, Dr. Weisman's, to him or anyone else?
4	A. If your question is was the entirety of his
5	training file ever photocopied and sent to somebody?
6	Q. That's not my no. So not necessarily
7	photocopied but released in terms of produced either as
8	a photocopy, a scan, or made available to him?
9	A. I don't know. And this, if I remember
10	correctly.
11	Q. Okay.
12	A. This was in reference to a letter of
13	recommendation, not the release of his training
14	records.
15	Q. You think that this authorization and release
16	is in relation to his training records?
17	A. No, no, no. What I'm what I'm saying is
18	despite the title of this e-mail, I believe this
19	exchange was in relation to a letter of recommendation.
20	Q. So it's your testimony then that you were
21	asking him to sign an authorization and release in
22	connection with a letter of recommendation?
23	A. That is where I believe that is the context
24	in which this e-mail fits in, I believe, yes.
25	Q. Do you see anything in the authorization and

1	release about a letter of recommendation?
2	MR. SULLIVAN: Objection. I'm going object to
3	form. Exhibit 20 speaks for itself.
4	You can take your time and read the release.
5	A. So this looks like it's in reference to a
6	letter of recommendation and a list of rotations he
7	completed.
8	Q. (By Mr. Elster) Where do you see a letter of
9	recommendation?
10	A. I thought I read that. Letter of evaluation
11	from the program director.
12	Q. A letter of evaluation is the same thing as a
13	letter of recommendation?
14	A. Yeah, I would consider those synonymous, yes.
15	Q. Well, have you ever asked someone to sign an
16	authorization or a release in connection with a letter
17	of evaluation and recommendation?
18	MR. SULLIVAN: Object to form. Asked and
19	answered.
20	Go ahead and answer.
21	A. I'm sorry. Am I supposed to answer it?
22	MR. SULLIVAN: Yeah, go ahead.
23	A. I don't believe so, no.
24	Q. (By Mr. Elster) Did you did you think it
25	was do you think it was appropriate to ask for this

release from Dr. Weisman?
A. I have no idea if it's appropriate or not.
Again, we don't often have residents leave the program.
And so this is this instance was fairly novel to me
so.
Q. That's cool.
At the time you made the decision not to
release the training file for Dr. Weisman because it
was an administrative burden?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. Wouldn't you have known that it would have
been difficult for him to get into another residency
program without the training file?
MR. SULLIVAN: I'm going to object to form.
Calls for speculation. Assumes facts not in evidence.
Go ahead and answer.
A. Do I think that not photocopying his entire
record would have made it difficult to get into another
residency program?
Q. (By Mr. Elster) I'm not saying photocopying,
I'm saying releasing. If you releasing. So whether
it be photocopying, making them available, scanning, in
some way producing?
A. No.
O. Wouldn't that have made it difficult?

1 Α. No, I don't believe so. 2 Why? 0. 3 Α. Because as I said earlier, as a program director, if I'm -- if I were to evaluate someone's 4 5 ability to complete a training program here at Wash U., I'm not going to base that decision on an exhaustive 6 review of that particular individual's entire file. 7 There are particular things that I would look 8 9 for in the file. But I'm not going to review the 10 entire file to make that decision. 11 But if you ask for a portion of the file from 0. 12 a resident and the resident says, Oh, they won't 13 release it to me unless I waive a lawsuit against them, 14 that doesn't raise any problems with you? 15 I'm going to object to form. MR. SULLIVAN: Assumes facts not in evidence. Misstates Exhibit 20 16 and is contrary to other evidence. 17 18 Go ahead and answer. 19 I'm sorry. What was the question? Α. 20 0. (By Mr. Elster) Okay. If a resident is 21 trying to go to Washington University and you ask for 22 a portion of their file, and he or she says, Well, I 23 can't give it to you 'cause they wanted me to sign a 24 release of liability and they said it's too much of an administrative burden, that doesn't seem like a problem 25

1	to you?
2	MR. SULLIVAN: Same objection.
3	Go ahead and answer.
4	A. I would wonder why the resident doesn't just
5	sign the liability form.
6	Q. (By Mr. Elster) And you wouldn't have you
7	wouldn't be concerned about why someone's asking
8	someone to sign a liability form?
9	A. I would
10	MR. SULLIVAN: I'm going to object. Let me
11	object. Assumes assumes a legal conclusion and
12	mischaracterizes Exhibit 20.
13	Go ahead and answer.
14	A. I would be curious as to why why there's
15	lawyers involved and why why is this convoluted.
16	That would be my concern.
17	Q. (By Mr. Elster) Would it give you a negative
18	impression?
19	MR. SULLIVAN: Object to form. Speculation.
20	Go ahead and answer.
21	A. I don't know. I've never I've never
22	encountered that situation so I can't really answer.
23	Q. (By Mr. Elster) Okay. But I'm asking from
24	based on your experience as a program director, would
25	that have given you a negative impression?

1	MR. SULLIVAN: Objection. Calls for
2	speculation. Asked and answered.
3	Go ahead.
4	A. I don't I don't know what kind of
5	conclusion I would have reached. There may be a
6	perfectly reasonable explanation. It's just not
7	something that I've encountered.
8	Q. (By Mr. Elster) Do you think it was ever
9	well, before we get into that. So you're now the Vice-
10	Chair for Education for the Department of
11	Anesthesiology; is that correct?
12	A. Correct.
13	Q. What does that entail?
14	A. Oversight for all of the training programs,
15	residency fellowships, and then dotted line
16	responsibilities for the SRNA program and APN program.
17	Q. What's the SRNA?
18	A. Student Registered Nurse Anesthetists.
19	Q. And APN?
20	A. Advanced Practice Nurses.
21	Q. Why did you transition from program director
22	to Vice-Chair for Education?
23	A. I was promoted.
24	Q. Who previously occupied that position?
25	A. Immediately before me, no one. It was vacant.

1	Prior to that, Dr. Tom Cox.
2	Q. Let's flip to Exhibit 2. Is Exhibit 2 e-mail
3	communications with you and Shirley Vaughn?
4	A. Uh-huh.
5	Q. Who is she?
6	A. She is one of the admins in the education
7	office.
8	Q. Okay. At this time were you the Director of
9	the Anesthesiology Department?
10	A. I was the program director.
11	Q. Program director. I want to ask you about the
12	e-mail on the top at 2:39 p.m. "Let me check with
13	Tom." Is that Cox?
14	A. Uh-huh.
15	Q. Dr. Cox?
16	A. Dr. Cox.
17	Q. Okay. And you say: I doubt I'm the
18	appropriate person to be writing him any letters. In
19	relation to Dr. Weisman. Why did you say that?
20	A. Well, I wasn't his program director. And at
21	this time I knew that there was a history with Dr.
22	Weisman and the program.
23	Q. Do you think it was ever appropriate for you
24	to write letters on Dr. Weisman's behalf?
25	A. What's the nature of your question? So I

1	certainly wrote quite I wrote letters of
2	recommendation on behalf of Dr. Weisman at his request.
3	But that letter was basically adopting a letter that
4	had been written by Dr. Benzinger. But the request was
5	to come from the current program director. So in my
6	role as the current program director, I used that
7	letter.
8	Q. I'll rephrase a little bit. So you say you're
9	not the appropriate person. Did you say that because
10	you weren't the program director when he was a
11	resident?
12	A. Correct.
13	Q. Did you also say that because you didn't
14	supervise or oversee Dr. Weisman when he was a
15	resident?
16	A. Well, so
17	MR. SULLIVAN: Object to form.
18	Mischaracterizes his prior testimony.
19	Go ahead and answer.
20	A. So as we discussed earlier, I did supervise
21	Dr. Weisman in a clinical manner, in a clinical
22	fashion, yes.
23	Q. (By Mr. Elster) Okay. But you can't recall
24	how many instances other than the one you mentioned
25	earlier at Children's, right?

_	
1	A. I don't recall specific instances other than
2	the one I mentioned, no.
3	Q. Any other reasons you wrote that you weren't
4	the appropriate person to be writing any letters?
5	A. Other than I've already listed? No, I don't
6	think so.
7	Q. Did you meet with Dr. Weisman after these
8	e-mails in August in August of 2018?
9	A. I believe I met with Dr. Weisman in my office.
10	I don't know temporally when it occurred. Before or
11	after this.
12	Q. What do you remember about that meeting?
13	A. Nothing really.
14	Q. Did he during that meeting or any time after
15	ask for your assistance in transferring to another
16	residency program?
17	A. I believe he asked for a letter of
18	recommendation. So in that fashion, yes, I guess you
19	could say he asked for assistance.
20	Q. Did you feel that you had any obligation to
21	assist him in transferring to another residency
22	program?
23	MR. SULLIVAN: Object to form. Vague.
24	Go ahead and answer.
25	A. I believe it's in the best interest of any

residency program to try to ensure the success of any
trainee that is in their program or left their program,
yes.
Q. (By Mr. Elster) Did you do anything to assist
Dr. Weisman in that end that you just described to
ensure his success after he left the program?
MR. SULLIVAN: Objection. Vague.
Go ahead and answer.
A. I wrote again, wrote a letter of
recommendation in that I borrowed or used the letter of
recommendation provided by Dr. Benzinger. I sent that
to multiple programs. Most of the requests that Dr.
Weisman sent to the program we complied with. With the
one exception that I felt it onerous to reproduce the
entirety of his file.
Q. (By Mr. Elster) Other than the letter you
said was mostly adopted from Dr. Benzinger's prior
letter, did you write any other letters on Dr.
Weisman's behalf?
A. I don't believe so.
Q. Okay. Did you express ever your personal
views or opinions of Dr. Weisman as a resident
anesthesiologist to any other medical institutes when
you were department head?
MR. SULLIVAN: Object to department head.

1	MR. ELSTER: Okay.
2	MR. SULLIVAN: Go ahead and answer.
3	A. I don't recall the conversation or the details
4	of the conversation or the conversation having taken
5	place. But I know that I did have a conversation with
6	Dr. Macario from Stanford I believe.
7	Q. (By Mr. Elster) And you mentioned that. What
8	do you remember about that?
9	A. I don't remember anything about it. The only
10	reason I know that it took place is because it was in
11	some of the documents that I reviewed.
12	Q. Do you know how long it took, the conversation
13	was?
14	A. I do not.
15	Q. Was anyone else present for the conversation?
16	A. I don't recall but that would be unlikely.
17	Q. Dr. Macario's at Stanford University?
18	A. I believe so.
19	Q. During that phone call would you have known
20	that Dr. Weisman was trying to transfer to Stanford
21	University?
22	MR. SULLIVAN: Object to form.
23	Go ahead and answer.
24	A. I don't know.
25	Q. (By Mr. Elster) Was the conversation about

1	Dr. Weisman?
2	A. I would assume the conversation was about Dr.
3	Weisman, yes.
4	Q. Did you do anything to ensure that Dr. Weisman
5	could transfer to Stanford University during that phone
6	call?
7	A. I don't
8	MR. SULLIVAN: Object to form.
9	A. I don't remember the details of the
10	conversation.
11	Q. (By Mr. Elster) Do you remember a single word
12	that was said
13	A. I do not.
14	Q in that conversation?
15	A. I don't, no.
16	Q. Okay.
17	A. When was that conversation?
18	Q. I'll have e-mails. We'll get to it. You
19	don't remember when that was?
20	A. I don't.
21	Q. Other than Dr. Macario did you communicate
22	and Dr. Patil which we we talked about earlier, any
23	other physicians or heads of any other medical
24	institutes you can
25	A So I did not communicate with Dr. Patil

verbally.
Q. It was in writing?
A. Correct.
Q. All right.
A. We mentioned Dr. Fox and Dr. Kaye, which were
also e-mail communications. We spoke about Dr. Epling,
which was e-mail communication. Other than those, I
can't recall, no.
Q. Temporally do you know where the conversation
with Dr. Macario occurred in relation to the to your
declining to release his training file?
A. I don't.
Q. And you don't know which happened first?
A. I don't. I'd have to look at the dates.
Q. Flip to Exhibit 3. Part of the it's
redacted because that's how it was produced to me so.
It's two pages.
A. Okay.
Q. Okay. So on the first e-mail and this is
just more for you wouldn't have any reason to
believe whether some of the things communicated here
are true or not true. So, for example, could not
present patients with any cohesiveness?
A. I have no knowledge about that.
Q. Okay. And then likewise on so the next

1	sentence: They had no clue what was going on, in
2	reference to Dr. Weisman, and someone else's identity's
3	redacted. And then likewise on the next page, you
4	wouldn't have any knowledge about the type of work that
5	was done there or described?
6	A. So this would have been before I started at
7	Wash U. so any knowledge I gained about this would have
8	been after the fact.
9	Q. Okay. Knowledge you gained about it. Have
10	you spoken with Dr. Benzinger about Dr. Weisman?
11	A. I'm sure I have, yeah.
12	Q. Have you heard Dr. Benzinger make any negative
13	statements about Dr. Weisman?
14	MR. SULLIVAN: Object to form. Vague.
15	Go ahead and answer.
16	A. I believe Dr. Benzinger expressed concerns
17	about about the progress of Dr. Weisman, yes.
18	Q. (By Mr. Elster) Did he express what type of
19	concerns?
20	A. So in general not meeting expectations and not
21	sort of up to the level of his peers.
22	Q. Outside of Dr. Benzinger, what about Dr.
23	Groener, have you heard him make any negative
24	statements about Dr. Weisman?
25	MR. SULLIVAN: Objection. Vague.

1	Go ahead and answer.
2	A. I don't recall any specifics from Dr. Groener
3	but and Dr. Groener's role but it's certainly a
4	possibility.
5	Q. (By Mr. Elster) What about Dr. Cox?
6	A. I don't remember any specific conversations
7	with Dr. Cox.
8	Q. What about Dr. Evers?
9	A. I don't believe I had any conversations with
10	Dr. Evers about this, about his performance as an
11	intern.
12	Q. What about otherwise?
13	A. This was e-mail communications with Dr. Evers
14	but it was not specific to his performance.
15	Q. What was it about?
16	A. There was some concern about a negative review
17	that was posted about the program that we suspected was
18	authored by Dr. Weisman.
19	Q. And what was the concern about?
20	A. It painted the program in a negative light and
21	wasn't I don't remember specifics but I don't recall
22	it being particularly factual.
23	Q. Okay. Well, how do you know I know you
24	don't have the what you're referring to in front of
25	you. You said it wasn't particularly factual. What

Τ	was incorrect about it?
2	A. Again, I don't recall specifics. That's just
3	my general sense of the post when I read it.
4	Q. When evaluations are completed for residents
5	at the anesthesiology program, what's the process for
6	them to be completed? It's not just well, you go.
7	I don't want to ask too many questions.
8	MR. SULLIVAN: Object to form. Vague.
9	Go ahead and answer.
10	A. So there's multiple ways the evaluations are
11	completed. So ideally the resident should get verbal
12	feedback every day about how they're doing. In lieu of
13	that, depending on the particular rotation that they're
14	on, they, at the end of their rotation at the very
15	least, should get written feedback about how they're
16	doing. That may take the form of milestones again.
17	Sometimes they're accompanied by narrative evaluations.
18	Q. (By Mr. Elster) For the written evaluations,
19	who would complete those?
20	A. Typically it's the rotational coordinator for
21	their rotation.
22	Q. If not the rotational coordinator, who else?
23	A. It should be the rotational coordinator that
24	fills out those evaluations. They might have
25	assistance with an admin but

1	Q. So the rotational coordinator or an
2	administrative assistant like a scribe or?
3	A. I wouldn't necessarily describe it as a
4	scribe. But, for example, you know, on the peds
5	rotation ideally we're submitting narrative comments
6	every day. An admin might help collate all those
7	comments and submit it to the rotational coordinator.
8	Q. Would it when you were the program
9	director?
LO	A. Uh-huh.
L1	Q. Would you do evaluations for people you
L2	weren't the immediate program coordinator for?
L3	A. Yeah, as I supervise them if I supervise
L <b>4</b>	them as a clinical faculty guy.
L5	Q. What if you didn't supervise them?
L6	A. If I didn't supervise them?
L <b>7</b>	Q. Yeah. Would you do the evaluations?
L8	MR. SULLIVAN: Object to form. Confusing.
L9	Go ahead and answer.
20	A. So in my role as the program director I
21	reviewed evaluations. And I might use those
22	evaluations and incorporate them into my six-month
23	review of the resident.
24	Q. (By Mr. Elster) Okay. If we can flip to
25	hand you Exhibit 4. Would you would you have been

1	at Washington University at this time, December of
2	2017?
3	A. No, I believe I started July 17th, 2017.
4	Q. Well, December is after July, right?
5	A. Sorry. Yes, you're right. Sorry.
6	Q. My question when you're ready. In that first
7	e-mail: Please do not submit an evaluation for
8	Weisman. And this is from Dr. Benzinger to Amy
9	Ficklen: Collect the comments and forward them to me,
10	but I'll do the evaluation. Is that a common practice?
11	MR. SULLIVAN: Object to form. Assumes facts
12	not in evidence.
13	Go ahead and answer.
14	A. I don't know who Amy Ficklen is. And let me
15	look at the e-mail.
16	MR. SULLIVAN: Yeah, read the entire e-mail.
17	A. Okay. So it appears that she is an
18	administrator coordinator.
19	Q. (By Mr. Elster) You you didn't know who
20	she was before?
21	A. No.
22	Q. And she's not at Wash U. anymore from what you
23	know?
24	A. I have no idea. But this is the first time to
25	my knowledge I've ever heard that name.

Q. So my question then was is it common what Dr.
Benzinger is describing here, Please do not submit an
evaluation for Dr. Weisman. Collect the comments and
forward them to me but I'll do the evaluation?
MR. SULLIVAN: I'll object to I mean, not
on this e-mail but I'll object to the extent it calls
for speculation.
Go ahead and answer.
A. It's not clear to me from the context of this
e-mail what he is referring to. What Dr. Benzinger is
referring to. So yeah, I'll just leave it at that.
Q. (By Mr. Elster) So when you were in Dr.
Benzinger's position
A. Uh-huh.
Q because you succeeded him, did you ever
give a send an e-mail like this where it's saying do
not send an evaluation for a resident where you wanted
to collect the comments and do the evaluation yourself?
A. When I was the program director did I ever say
something similar to this? Is that your question?
Q. Right.
A. I don't believe so.
Q. Do you think it would have been appropriate
when you were the program director to do that?
MR. SULLIVAN: Objection. Assumes facts not

1	in evidence. Contrary to the facts in evidence.
2	Go ahead and answer.
3	A. It depends on it depends on what I was
4	trying to accomplish with that.
5	Q. (By Mr. Elster) But to be clear, you never
6	did do that?
7	A. I don't believe I ever did that as a
8	program as a program director, no.
9	Q. Flip to Exhibit 5.
10	MR. SULLIVAN: Do you want him to read all of
11	these e-mails or do you have specific?
12	MR. ELSTER: Oh, I'm going to have some
13	specific questions.
14	Q. (By Mr. Elster) So the first e-mail is
15	December of 2017?
16	A. Uh-huh.
17	Q. 15 of 2017. I think all of them are except
18	for the last e-mail of January 11th, 2018.
19	At this time do you recall that there were
20	some conversations about Dr. Weisman not completing the
21	program December of 2017?
22	MR. SULLIVAN: I have no objection.
23	Go ahead.
24	A. I was included in e-mails where there was
25	concerns raised, yes.

1	Q. (By Mr. Elster) Okay. But you knew that
2	there were concerns by other people, not necessarily
3	you?
4	A. About his completion of the program?
5	Q. Correct.
6	A. Yes.
7	Q. Did you have any concerns at the time about
8	him completing the program?
9	A. Again, my experience with him was fairly
10	limited. But based on the incidents that I recalled
11	and related to you, yes, I had concerns.
12	Q. Based on that one incident?
13	A. That's a pretty big incident.
14	Q. But just just one incident, that's it?
15	A. One incident of a patient waking up in the
16	middle of the surgery is a big deal. And recall during
17	surgery is a big deal. Yes, that is a big incident.
18	Yes, I recall that.
19	Q. Okay. Did anyone wake up during the surgery
20	with Dr. Weisman?
21	A. Had I not come into the room when I did, that
22	is a distinct possibility, yes.
23	Q. Okay. But did it happen?
24	A. Had I not come into the room when I did, that
25	is a distinct possibility.

1	Q. Wasn't there some malfunctioning with some of
2	the equipment during that surgery?
3	A. No.
4	Q. Okay. Are you sure?
5	A. There was no malfunction of the equipment.
6	There was a failure on Dr. Weisman's behalf to use the
7	equipment properly. Furthermore, there was a failure
8	of Dr. Weisman to look at the monitor and realize what
9	was going on.
10	Q. Okay. Have you ever relayed this incident to
11	anyone else?
12	A. I probably included it in the comments to Dr.
13	Groener but I haven't a specific memory.
14	Q. Why do you say probably?
15	A. Because it was a big deal, as I've tried to
16	express here, so it's concerning. So I probably in my
17	capacity as an evaluating him for that particular day's
18	performance as a clinician, probably included it in my
19	evaluation.
20	Q. Based on that one incident did you have
21	concerns about his aptitude as expressed in this
22	e-mail?
23	MR. SULLIVAN: Which e-mail are you referring
24	to?
25	MR. ELSTER: The first one of Exhibit 5 and

1	specifically the second paragraph.
2	MR. SULLIVAN: I would just caution you, Dr.
3	Thompson, to read the entire first page of Exhibit 5,
4	the first e-mail.
5	A. Okay. I'm sorry. What's your question?
6	Q. (By Mr. Elster) Okay. So there's a reference
7	in paragraph 2 that aptitude may contribute. And this
8	is from Dr. Benzinger. My question was, based on the
9	incident you've described at Children's, based on that
10	did you have a concern about his aptitude overall as a
11	resident anesthesiologist?
12	A. Are you asking if I had personal concerns?
13	Q. Correct.
14	A. Yeah.
15	Q. Just based on that? And it's based on that?
16	A. Yes.
17	Q. Okay. Did you have any positive experiences
18	when you were with Dr. Weisman?
19	A. Again, I don't recall all the instances where
20	I worked with him. I know that not every instance
21	where I worked with him did he have episodes like that.
22	Q. Would you be able to look, but not necessarily
23	right now, on how many consult some document or
24	calendar to figure out how many times you worked with
25	him? Is there a record of that anywhere?

A. So shortly after I started on staff we
transitioned to a different electronic health record.
So now we use Epic. And I don't recall which system we
were on when when Dr. Weisman was training here.
So the answer to your question is I'm not
sure. If it was on the old system, I'm not sure if we
still have access to that.
Q. Okay. On the one, two fourth paragraph
down there's a discussion, a one sentence paragraph,
about an acceptable compromise. Do you know if Dr.
Weisman ever reached any sort of agreement with Dr.
Benzinger?
A. I'm sorry, which paragraph are you looking at?
Q. Fourth.
A. After obviously?
Q. Correct.
A. Okay.
Q. So there's a reference to compromise.
Do you know if Dr. Weisman ever reached any
sort of agreement with Dr. Benzinger in connection with
his leaving the program?
MR. SULLIVAN: I'm going to object to the form
with respect to calling for a legal conclusion as to an
agreement.
Go ahead and answer.

A. I know from e-mail exchanges that Dr.
Benzinger discussed with Dr. Weisman about leaving the
program.
Q. (By Mr. Elster) Okay. Do you know if
there in those discussions or otherwise if they
reached any sort of if there were any discussions
about the terms on which he would leave?
MR. SULLIVAN: Object to form with respect to
it calls with respect to calling for a legal
conclusion.
Go ahead and answer.
A. I'm sorry, what?
Q. (By Mr. Elster) Based on what you remember
reviewed about those discussions and outside of that?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you recall any discussions about the terms
of Dr. Weisman leaving, such as when it would happen,
the manner, and so on?
MR. SULLIVAN: Same objection.
Go ahead and answer.
A. I know that they discussed in general terms
there was basically two decisions that Dr. Weisman was
sort of contemplating. Whether to stay in the program
and try to finish the residency, or whether or not to
leave. And I know that Dr. Benzinger and Dr. Weisman

1	had conversations around that.
2	Q. (By Mr. Elster) Were you around for any of
3	those conversations?
4	A. In person?
5	Q. I'll start in person first.
6	A. I don't believe I was in I don't believe I
7	was around in person for any of those conversations.
8	Q. What about remotely or through e-mail
9	communication?
10	A. I was probably I was included in some of
11	the e-mail communication, yes.
12	Q. Okay. You can flip to 419, which is on the
13	bottom right. So I'm referring to these numbers down
14	here. And they don't necessarily go.
15	A. Okay.
16	Q. And I'm asking about the e-mail on the top.
17	So at 8:20 a.m., which you were copied on. It says:
18	Ultimately, a voluntary resignation isn't something one
19	appeals; since it's voluntary, which I think is
20	which why I think this is a desirable outcome.
21	And looking at it, were there any
22	conversations about removing involuntarily Dr. Weisman
23	from the residency program?
24	A. Involuntarily removing?
25	Q. So for cause or for other reasons.

A. There was concern that he might have to
remediate some of his training. But to my recollection
I don't believe there were conversations about removing
him.
Q. If there was a remediation plan put into
place, would there have been some administrative
grievance procedure that Dr. Weisman could have
initiated to dispute that?
A. I believe that's correct, yes.
Q. Okay. Is it fair to say that there is a
dispute or grievance procedure if there's a voluntary
resignation?
A. I don't know. I would presume so if it's
voluntary.
Q. Presume so or presume not?
A. I would presume that there's no.
Q. No. Okay. As Dr. Benzinger says, It's not
something you can appeal. Would you agree with him?
A. Well, if the resident is voluntarily leaving,
then, yeah, it wouldn't make sense to then appeal the
voluntary leaving. If I follow your question.
Q. And flip to Exhibit 6. The next one. Exhibit
6 is an e-mail and then there's an attachment of the
Dr. Benzinger letter.
Did you give input on the contents of this

1	letter which is attached?
2	MR. SULLIVAN: Go ahead and familiarize
3	yourself with the letter, Doctor.
4	A. Your question is if I gave input?
5	Q. (By Mr. Elster) Correct. Because it was
6	it appears that it was forwarded to you. Like an hour
7	after it was originally sent you were included.
8	A. I believe I was forwarded a draft of this and
9	I believe Dr. Benzinger asked for input. I don't
10	recall if I gave any input.
11	Q. Do you know who did give input on the letter?
12	A. I believe Dr. Cox had a small statement that
13	he made about the letter but other other than that I
14	don't.
15	Q. Other than Dr. Cox and Dr. Benzinger, do you
16	know anyone else and the people listed on this
17	e-mail, on the first one, the January 11th e-mail, who
18	else would have reviewed it?
19	A. Other than the people that are already listed
20	here?
21	Q. Correct. And then you subsequently.
22	A. I don't know that anyone else would have
23	would have reviewed it.
24	Q. To your understanding did everyone agree with
25	the contents of the letter?

1	A. That's my understanding.
2	Q. Okay. Including you?
3	A. To the extent that I was involved, yes.
4	Q. Okay. Well, to the extent that you were
5	involved. So that could mean you weren't involved. So
6	what
7	A Well, I wasn't I wasn't the program
8	director.
9	Q. Okay. Well, I know you weren't the program
10	director as of January 2018. But it was forwarded to
11	you because you were the program director in waiting;
12	is that right?
13	A. Correct.
14	Q. Okay. So would you have reviewed this at the
15	time?
16	A. As I stated, I believe I reviewed a draft of
17	this, yes.
18	Q. Okay. And you don't believe you made any
19	changes to it?
20	A. I don't think so, no.
21	Q. Okay. Did you agree with ultimately with
22	what was signed as this attachment here?
23	A. I'm sorry. Are you asking if I agree with?
24	Q. The contents.
25	A. With the letter?

1	Q. Correct.
	~
2	And it's dated January 11th, 2018. So on the
3	same date as the e-mails.
4	A. I mean, for the most part the letter is pretty
5	factual, so I'm not sure what I would disagree with.
6	Q. So you don't disagree with anything in there?
7	A. I don't think that there's anything here that
8	as the associate program director I would have
9	disagreed with.
10	MR. ELSTER: Okay. You want to take a quick
11	break for lunch? We've been going for about an hour,
12	if you want.
13	MR. SULLIVAN: Yeah, but let's make it
14	quick.
15	MR. ELSTER: Okay, yeah.
16	VIDEOGRAPHER: We're off the record at 12:03
17	p.m.
18	(Lunch break.)
19	VIDEOGRAPHER: We're back on the record at
20	12:49 p.m.
21	Q. (By Mr. Elster) Dr. Thompson, do residents
22	make mistakes during their residency program?
23	A. Of course they do.
24	Q. Okay. Have you ever met a resident that
25	didn't make mistakes?

1	A. I don't know how to answer that.
2	Q. There's not a perfect resident in terms of
3	training, right?
4	A. Probably not, no.
5	Q. Therefore, residents that grad U graduate
6	from the Washington University Anesthesiology Program,
7	they've all made mistakes for the most part, right?
8	A. Presumably.
9	Q. Did you ever communicate to Dr. Weisman over
10	the phone that you couldn't write any sort of letter
11	for him because you'd only worked with him one or two
12	times?
13	A. I don't know.
14	Q. You don't know one way or the other?
15	A. I don't know one way or another.
16	Q. Let's flip to Exhibit 7 and I'll try to fire
17	through these. The second page, 454, on the bottom
18	right so it's a Bates labeling. What is the NI report
19	in the top e-mail?
20	A. NI stands for new innovations. It's just the
21	online sort of web portal we use that we use for
22	evaluations.
23	Q. Okay. Is this you filled out a new
24	innovations report. Is it related to Dr. Weisman?
25	A. I can't tell from the concept context of

1	that but since you're giving it to me I would presume
2	so.
3	Q. Okay. The bottom e-mail refers to the quest
4	remains who will be doing Jeff Weisman?
5	The bottom e-mail says: but the quest remains
6	on who will be doing Jeff Weisman, and it's redacted?
7	A. Formal six-month.
8	Q. Formal six-month review. So in looking at
9	that, does the NI report relate to Dr. Weisman?
10	A. It would appear that way.
11	Q. How many of those reports did you do for him?
12	A. This assuming I filled this one out, this
13	probably would have been the only one.
14	Q. Okay. Are you aware of any complaints Dr.
15	Weisman has made that he didn't get a six-month review
16	at any period of time?
17	A. The only complaint that I know of regarding
18	evaluations was about the summative evaluation. So I
19	guess the answer to your question is no, I'm not aware
20	of that.
21	Q. And the complaint to be sure on that is that
22	there wasn't a summative evaluation?
23	A. Correct.
24	Q. And you're saying one has been created now?
25	A. It has been.

1	Q. Have you seen it?
2	A. I have.
3	Q. Who created it?
4	A. I believe it was Dr. Mitchell, the current
5	program director.
6	Q. Sometime after September of 2021?
7	A. Uh-huh. If that's when the request was, yeah.
8	Q. Do you know if Dr. Mitchell has sent it to
9	anyone?
10	A. I don't know.
11	Q. Did you assist in completing that evaluation?
12	A. I may have had some input into it. But I
13	believe it was I didn't put I didn't put much
14	effort into putting that together, no.
15	Q. Did anyone else have any input into putting
16	that together?
17	MR. SULLIVAN: And just to I'll object to
18	the extent it would involve any attorney-client
19	communication, if there was any.
20	Subject to that you can answer.
21	A. The only other person that I know of that
22	would have put input into it other than Dr. Mitchell
23	would have been Lauren Gibson.
24	Q. (By Mr. Elster) Who is that?
25	A. Her official title is the Finance Director for

Education.	
Q. I think you've testified earlier that there	
was a concern that Dr. Weisman was below his peers in	
terms of his evaluations; is that right?	
A. Correct.	
Q. Okay. And when you made that, is that an	
opinion that you had?	
A. So it's an opinion that I have based on my	
limited interaction with him. But it's also the	
opinion that I gathered looking at some of his other	
evaluations.	
Q. And in making that determination, does that	
inevitably involve comparing his evaluation with other	
residencies residents' evaluations?	
MR. SULLIVAN: Object to form.	
A. Not necessarily comparing his evaluations to	
other resident evaluations, more comparing his	
performance to other residents.	
Q. (By Mr. Elster) So how do you determine his	
performance relative to other residents without looking	
at other residents' files and evaluations?	
A. I've worked with residents for the last 15	
years, so my comparisons are based on my experience	
working with other residents.	
Q. Well, wasn't the opinion that he was below	

1	other residents at Washington University?
2	MR. SULLIVAN: Object to form. Argumentative.
3	Go ahead and answer.
4	A. It would be my opinion that based on his level
5	of training he's behind residents that I've worked with
6	here and also at the University of Washington in
7	Seattle.
8	Q. (By Mr. Elster) Flip to 458. I'm going to
9	ask about the e-mail from Dr. Cox in the middle. So at
10	11:48 a.m. I think you were talking about this
11	earlier.
12	A. Uh-huh.
13	Q. There's a there's a request or sentiment to
14	reschedule a meeting to after deadlines so Jeff is not
15	receiving a letter or additional negative feedback
16	after deadline?
17	A. Uh-huh.
18	Q. What's the deadline that's being referred to
19	there?
20	MR. SULLIVAN: And just, Counsel, you didn't
21	read the entire e-mail chain. That goes over to 459
22	too.
23	A. So back to your question, I believe the
24	deadline they're referring to is the deadline for
25	residents or medical students to apply to residency

1	programs through the ERAS system, E-R-A-S.
2	Q. (By Mr. Elster) What is the meeting that's
3	being referred to as rescheduled?
4	A. I would assume from the context of the rest of
5	the document they're referring to the six-month
6	evaluation, but I'm not for sure positively.
7	Q. Do you know if meetings were rescheduled until
8	after this deadline to avoid any negative comments?
9	A. I don't know.
10	Q. There's actually an e-mail you sent at the
11	bottom of 458 and it goes into 459.
12	A. Uh-huh.
13	Q. And it says: Do we actually have evidence
14	(other than the ACGME survey) that Jeff has said or
15	published anything about the program?
16	A. Uh-huh.
17	Q. I guess presently now do do you know of
18	anything Jeff has said, said or published about the
19	program?
20	A. That was said concretely, no, I don't have
21	evidence. Although, as we've discussed earlier, there
22	was the suspicion that he created the post on
23	ScutWork's I think is the website.
24	Q. On the e-mail later on 459 from Dr. Cox
25	MR. SULLIVAN: It's actually earlier in

1	time?
2	MR. ELSTER: Earlier in time. So it's 11:18.
3	Q. (By Mr. Elster) He refers to a recent
4	escalation of negative activity. Last sentence, first
5	paragraph.
6	A. Uh-huh.
7	Q. Do you have any firsthand knowledge of
8	escalation of negative activity?
9	A. I think what Dr. Cox is referring to is the
10	web post that I referred to earlier.
11	Q. But you wouldn't have any firsthand knowledge
12	of escalation of negative activity?
13	A. That would represent an escalation of negative
14	activity, yes.
15	Q. And my question is are you a witness to any
16	negative activity by Dr. Weisman as referred to here?
17	A. If your question is do I know definitely if
18	Dr. Weisman posted that?
19	Q. Know or witnessed any negative activity is
20	what.
21	A. I don't concretely know that. Witnessed
22	negative activity, no, I don't think I witnessed
23	negative activity.
24	Q. 461. The top e-mail from Dr. Benzinger to you
25	and Dr. Cox. The last sentence. The 1:36 p.m. e-mail

1	says a summative letter.
2	A. Uh-huh.
3	Q. What is a summative letter?
4	A. I'm not sure exactly but I would assume what
5	he meant was the letter of recommendation.
6	Q. Okay.
7	A. Or it could have also been a letter from the
8	program to Dr. Weisman just kind of stating where he
9	was in the program at that at that period of time.
10	So it might be related to the six-month six-month
11	review.
12	Q. Do you know if there's a distinction between a
13	summative letter and summative evaluation?
14	A. I think they would probably be the same.
15	Q. Probably the same.
16	Flip to 489. So the top e-mail from Dr.
17	Benzinger at 9:49 a.m. On the second to last
18	paragraph. Do you agree with his statement: Our
19	department will provide you or any other resident the
20	strongest letter of recommendation that we can. It's
21	an obligation of any residency program?
22	A. Do I agree with that statement?
23	Q. Yeah.
24	A. Absolutely.
25	Q. Do you think that you've done that for Dr.

Weisman?
A. Provide the strongest letter we can?
Q. Yes.
A. Yes.
Q. Have you had any when you when you would
write the letter of recommendations, aren't they just
generally written to whom it may concern and then
that's utilized by Dr. Weisman or another resident and
given to another residency program? It's not
personalized to a specific hospital?
MR. SULLIVAN: I'm going to object. It's
compound, confusing.
Go ahead and answer.
A. It depends on the purpose of the letter.
Q. (By Mr. Elster) Okay.
A. So there are times when I will personalize the
letter on behalf of a resident or a fellow.
Q. Did you ever personalize a letter for Dr.
Weisman?
A. I don't recall.
Q. Would they just be generally worded letters,
meaning to whom it may concern or so on?
A. Are you asking in the instance of Dr. Weisman
were they generally worded letters?
Q. Correct.

1	A. I believe the letters I've provided for him
2	were generally worded, yes.
3	Q. Did he ever ask you to write a letter of
4	recommendation for him?
5	MR. SULLIVAN: Objection. Asked and answered.
6	Go ahead and answer.
7	A. He asked me to provide letters of
8	recommendation on his behalf, yes.
9	Q. (By Mr. Elster) And if I understand, the only
10	one that you had written was mostly based on Dr.
11	Benzinger's draft; is that right?
12	A. Correct.
13	Q. Do you agree with me that it would kind of
14	defeat the purpose of a letter of recommendation if you
15	had a phone call with another department head where you
16	contradict what the letter of recommendation says?
17	MR. SULLIVAN: I'm going to object to the
18	question and form. Assumes facts not in evidence.
19	Improper hypothetical. Argumentative.
20	Go ahead and answer.
21	A. I'm sorry. Can you repeat the question?
22	Q. (By Mr. Elster) Sure. Do you agree with me
23	that it would defeat the purpose of the letter of
24	recommendation if it's sent to a particular program but
25	then you subsequently or before had a phone call with

1	someone at that program that contradict the letter?
2	MR. SULLIVAN: Same objection.
3	Go ahead and answer.
4	A. If you're asking in generalities, that
5	might that might be that might what's the word
6	I'm looking for?
7	Q. (By Mr. Elster) Undermine?
8	A. Undermine the letter, sure.
9	Q. You can flip to Exhibit 8. I want to ask you
10	about the bottom e-mail when you're ready. On the
11	first page.
12	A. On 507?
13	Q. Yeah.
14	A. Okay.
15	Q. Okay. What is the CTICU?
16	A. Cardiothoracic Intensive Care Unit.
17	Q. And then the CCC, is that the Clinical
18	Competency Committee?
19	A. Correct.
20	Q. Who was on that at this time?
21	A. So I won't be able to provide you with all the
22	names. But in general it's headed up by Dr. Groener.
23	And then all of the rotation coordinators are on the
24	committee, myself, Dr. Mitchell currently.
25	Q. Okay. And then the unsatisfactory to the ABA,

1	what is that referring to in this e-mail?
2	A. The sentence in the worst case scenario?
3	Q. Yeah.
4	A. Fails. That means that the ABA would be
5	notified that he for that prior six months, that
6	he his performance was deemed unsatisfactory.
7	Q. Okay. And Dr. Benzinger refers to, It would
8	hurt his career needlessly if all three of those things
9	happened. Do you see that?
10	A. Yes.
11	Q. Okay. Do you agree they would hurt his career
12	if all three of those things happened?
13	A. I agree it wouldn't look good if all three of
14	those things happened, yes.
15	Q. Did you have any conversations about Dr.
16	Benzinger about Dr. Weisman's research request at this
17	time?
18	A. Did I have conversations about his research
19	request? No, I don't think I would have because I
20	wasn't the program director.
21	Q. Outside of writing the letter of
22	recommendation?
23	A. Uh-huh.
24	Q. That you had mentioned that was based on Dr.
25	Benzinger's letter.

1	Since Dr. Weisman left Washington University
2	have you done anything to help his career?
3	MR. SULLIVAN: Object to form. Already asked
4	and answered.
5	Go ahead and answer.
6	A. I have submitted documentation as he
7	requested, including that letter that you referred to
8	and rotation schedules.
9	Q. (By Mr. Elster) Flip to Exhibit 9. This is
10	similar to an e-mail we looked at before. This is a
11	draft of a letter that Dr. Benzinger sent to you and
12	Dr. Cox on April 27th of 2018?
13	A. Uh-huh.
14	Q. Did you have any input as to the contents of
15	this letter?
16	A. I believe I answered that earlier but
17	Q. I think
18	A I believe he sent me a draft and I if I
19	made any comments, it wasn't substantive.
20	Q. So this is a few months later. This is April
21	of 2018. The one we looked at was January of 2018.
22	A. Okay.
23	Q. You don't know if you made any edits to
24	yourself? You looked at it but you don't know if you
25	made any edits to it?

1	MR. SULLIVAN: Time time can we clarify
2	time frame?
3	Q. (By Mr. Elster) In April of 2018.
4	MR. SULLIVAN: Thank you.
5	Q. (By Mr. Elster) It appears that Dr. Benzinger
6	sent this in April of 2018 and he's asking for your
7	comments on it.
8	A. Yeah. I'm not sure that I made any comments
9	about this. If I did, it wasn't anything substantive.
10	Q. Did you agree with the contents of the letter
11	before Dr. Benzinger signed it?
12	A. Yeah, I believe in general. Given the
13	conditions it's a positive letter.
14	Q. Given the conditions, what conditions?
15	A. Well, he didn't finish the program.
16	Q. Is it common on these letters to include at
17	the very end the person's cell phone and say contact me
18	if you have any questions?
19	A. It's not uncommon, yeah.
20	Q. Okay. Have you ever had any communications
21	with Dr. Benzinger about conversations he has had about
22	Dr. Weisman with other anesthesiology programs?
23	MR. SULLIVAN: Object to form.
24	A. No.
25	Q. (By Mr. Elster) Exhibit 10. First page, 563.

1	So this is June of 2018. It's about one month before
2	you became program director?
3	A. Uh-huh.
4	Q. Did you come at the end of July or beginning
5	of July?
6	A. I don't recall specifically. It probably
7	would have been at the beginning of July.
8	Q. Okay. So about four or five days
9	A. Yeah.
10	Q before you would have started?
11	As far as you're aware is that letter of
12	recommendation we looked at, Exhibit 9, would that have
13	been sent to Cook County, which is the healthcare
14	institute mentioned here.
15	MR. SULLIVAN: I'm going to object. It calls
16	for speculation. The letter is not attached to this
17	exhibit. He's not even on it.
18	But go ahead and answer if you can.
19	A. Do you want me to answer the question?
20	MR. SULLIVAN: Yeah, go ahead.
21	A. To my knowledge Dr. Benzinger only created one
22	letter. So if he's saying here he's attaching a letter
23	of recommendation, I would assume it's that letter we
24	just looked at.
25	Q. (By Mr. Elster) Okay. And it's the one that

1	you you had input on that letter, right? You didn't
2	make any substantive changes?
3	A. Correct.
4	Q. Okay. As to the second page, 566, additional
5	two months of intern rotations is mentioned in the
6	second paragraph of the top e-mail. What is that
7	referring to?
8	MR. SULLIVAN: Doctor, you might just want to
9	read this entire e-mail, not just that, to get a
10	context.
11	Q. (By Mr. Elster) They're spread out in 2018.
12	A. Okay. I'm sorry. So your question is what is
13	that two months related to?
14	Q. Right.
15	A. So I don't have intimate knowledge of this but
16	I believe that refers to him having to remediate two
17	months of his intern clinical schedule.
18	Q. And if you can go to 598?
19	A. Okay.
20	Q. These are e-mails with you and Dr. Weisman. I
21	think we were talking about this before earlier. Is
22	the bottom e-mail first to Dr. Patil.
23	A. Uh-huh.
24	Q. Do you see that?
25	A. Uh-huh.

Q. The pr	ogram documents, is that the
approximately 2	00 pages of training file we were
talking about b	efore?
A. I'm so	rry, what are you referring to? At the
top where I	I said the documents will be sent out?
Q. Right.	So below that there is an e-mail at
2:59 p.m. where	it appears Dr. Weisman is asking you?
A. Okay.	
Q. And th	en Stephanie?
A. Uh-huh	•
Q. To sen	d his program documents to Dr. Patil?
A. Uh-huh	•
Q. And yo	u respond that the documents will be
sent out tomorr	ow?
A. Uh-huh	•
Q. What d	ocuments were sent out the following day
because and	I'm trying to make sense of earlier you
had testified t	hat you thought it was an administrative
burden to do th	at.
A. To cla	rify, I thought it was an administrative
burden to repro	duce his entire file. As I've said
previously, we	were happy to send out specific things
in his file.	
Now, b	ack to your question, what documents am
I referring to?	Without larger context I'm not sure

1	what documents these were specifically.
2	Q. Do you know if any documents were sent out?
3	A. To Dr. Patil?
4	Q. Yeah.
5	A. Yeah.
6	Q. Program documents?
7	A. So I believe the documents that were sent to
8	Dr. Patil would have been rotation schedules and
9	perhaps milestone evaluations.
10	Q. Who would have sent those personally?
11	A. It probably would have been the administrative
12	assistant at the time. So it may have been Stephanie
13	Rheinheimer.
14	Q. But to confirm, do you know if those documents
15	were in fact sent?
16	A. Without being able to see an e-mail trail,
17	it's hard for me to say it but I have no reason to
18	believe that they were not sent.
19	Q. On the next page, 599, you had asked you
20	had asked at the 9:07 a.m. e-mail: What type of
21	residency program are you applying to? These are part
22	of the e-mails with you and Dr. Weisman.
23	A. Sorry.
24	MR. SULLIVAN: Where were we?
25	MR. ELSTER: At 9:07 a.m.

A. Got it.
MR. SULLIVAN: Oh, okay. Thanks.
Q. (By Mr. Elster) Does it matter, the fact that
it's a residency program? What's the purpose of that
question?
A. I think so I don't remember specifically
why I was asking that question. But probably because I
don't think anesthesiology would have been a good
choice for him to transfer.
Q. Why?
A. For reasons that we've already alluded to.
Q. So if it was a different specialty or a
different practice outside of anesthesiology, would it
be fair to say that you would have provided a different
level of assistance?
A. No.
MR. SULLIVAN: Object.
A. I don't think that's a fair statement.
MR. SULLIVAN: Argumentative. Objection.
Go ahead and answer.
Q. (By Mr. Elster) Okay.
A. I would have provided the same level of
support. I think it would have made me feel more
comfortable had he not chosen anesthesiology as a
discipline.

1	Q. For the reason because of what we've talked
2	about already?
3	A. Correct.
4	Q. Did you ever communicate that to Dr. Weisman
5	in 2018 when he was asking you for a letter of
6	recommendation?
7	A. Did I ever communicate that I had concerns if
8	he was trying to go into anesthesiology?
9	Q. Correct.
10	A. I don't believe so.
11	Q. Why not?
12	A. I'm not sure that that ever came up.
13	Q. Okay. Well, you brought it up here. What
14	type of residency program was it?
15	A. Well, I asked a question. I don't know that I
16	ever had a conversation with him about his
17	appropriateness of going into anesthesiology or not.
18	Q. At that time you thought it was inappropriate
19	for him to go into anesthesiology?
20	A. I guess I would reword the question. Would I
21	feel comfortable with Dr. Weisman taking care of a
22	family member or my children, no.
23	Q. As of 2018?
24	A. Correct.
25	Q. Okay. Including thereafter?

1	A. Well, it's kind of a moot question because he
2	never finished an anesthesiology residency training
3	program.
4	Q. Did Stephanie you said her last name was
5	Wineheimer?
6	A. Rheinheimer.
7	Q. Rheinheimer.
8	A. And I apologize. I don't know how to spell
9	that.
10	Q. Is she still at Washington University?
11	A. She's no longer in the Department of
12	Anesthesiology. I believe she's still at Wash U. but
13	I'm not positive.
14	Q. Flip to 601. So 601 to 604 are similar. Not
15	the same thing as we just saw in Exhibit 20.
16	A. I'm sorry, 604?
17	Q. 601 to 604 are part of the same e-mail chain.
18	And I believe those are the same as what we saw in
19	Exhibit 20.
20	MR. SULLIVAN: I think in the last at least
21	the first e-mail in the chain as Exhibit 20 without the
22	attachment. So if you want to familiarize yourself
23	what these e-mails, Doctor.
24	A. Okay.
25	Q. (By Mr. Elster) Okay. In looking at these

1	e-mails, these kind of refer to what we were talking
2	about before in Exhibit 20 and the signed release
3	A. Uh-huh.
4	Q or the release that was provided. And on
5	603, it appears to be the same e-mail as was the
6	exhibit here as the release?
7	A. Uh-huh.
8	Q. In looking at these do you still think the
9	release that we talked about in Exhibit 20 was related
10	to your recommendation letter?
11	MR. SULLIVAN: Object to the form. The
12	e-mails speak for themselves.
13	Go ahead and answer.
14	A. So if I refer to the e-mail dated November
15	28th, it would appear that it's related to the letter
16	as well as rotation schedule.
17	Q. (By Mr. Elster) The doc be the rotation
18	schedule would just be his rotations that he worked
19	A. Correct.
20	Q while at the
21	And you never had any who is Dr. Fox
22	referenced there?
23	A. I don't know who that individual is. I
24	assumed it's somebody at one of these programs that Dr.
25	Weisman was applying to.

1	Q. Is it someone at the University of Chicago?
2	A. I don't know.
3	Q. And Dr. Kaye we talked about?
4	A. I believe that's Dr. Kaye is from Louisiana
5	I believe.
6	Q. Did you have any other communications orally
7	or in writing with them about Dr. Weisman?
8	A. I never spoke with them in person. I may have
9	exchanged other e-mails with them but it would have
10	been at the request of Dr. Weisman.
11	Q. What about phone calls?
12	MR. SULLIVAN: Objection. Asked and answered.
13	A. I never spoke with him.
14	Q. (By Mr. Elster) You can flip to Exhibit 11.
15	We start in the back. These aren't Bates labeled
16	because they were from Stanford. So the back page to
17	the front.
18	MR. SULLIVAN: So just one item, Henry. I
19	guess they were marked confidential by Stanford?
20	MR. ELSTER: They were.
21	MR. SULLIVAN: I don't know if there's I
22	haven't had any communications with Stanford so I don't
23	know if there's any obligation to be confidential.
24	I'll leave it to you.
25	MR. ELSTER: I don't think it matters.

1	MR. SULLIVAN: Okay.
2	Q. (By Mr. Elster) Okay. So on page 1 and going
3	into page 2, there's an e-mail from you to Dr. Macario
4	on December 7th, 2018?
5	A. Uh-huh.
6	Q. Was it at this time that Dr. Macario was
7	reaching out to you to discuss Dr. Weisman?
8	A. It was around that time, yes.
9	Q. Okay. Is there a reason you didn't give
10	your any feedback in any e-mail or in writing? You
11	just provided a phone number?
12	A. I don't recall what specific what specific
13	reason I would have had other than he already had the
14	letter of recommendation.
15	Q. So you knew as of December 7th of 2018 that
16	Dr. Macario had the letter of recommendation that he
17	wrote; is that correct?
18	A. I don't know that he had it definitively, but
19	by that time I would have assumed he would have had it.
20	Q. Did you communicate did you know who
21	Dr. Macario was before December of 2018?
22	A. No.
23	Q. Okay. Above that it says: Here you go.
24	Attached to the December 7th at 2:17 p.m. Do you know
25	what you provided in that?

1	A. It's hard to know without further context. It
2	probably was the letter of recommendation.
3	Q. Okay. And then immediately above that,
4	December 8th, 2018, so it would be the following
5	morning?
6	A. Uh-huh.
7	Q. In looking at that e-mail and it says: Spoke
8	with Douglas. Would the communication, that have
9	happened sometime between December 7th at 2:17 and
10	December 8 here?
11	A. Uh-huh.
12	Q. The phone call would have happened at that
13	point?
14	A. So I presumably the phone call occurred
15	after 2:17 on the 7th.
16	Q. Okay. And you had spoken it says: Spoke
17	with Douglas on phone and please see attached letter.
18	Several red flags. We should pass on him.
19	Do you know what that's referring to based on
20	your phone call with Dr. Macario?
21	MR. SULLIVAN: I'll object to form. Calls for
22	speculation.
23	But go ahead and answer.
24	A. I don't recall. First of all, I don't
25	actually recall having this conversation with

1	Dr. Macario. The only reason I know that it happened
2	is because of these e-mail chains. I don't recall
3	specifics that I discussed with Dr. Macario nor is it
4	clear to me if his comment is referring to the
5	conversation I had with him or the letter.
6	Q. (By Mr. Elster) The recommendation letter
7	that you wrote?
8	A. Correct.
9	Q. Would it have been common to talk to
10	discuss Dr. Weisman's abilities as a resident
11	anesthesiologist during that phone call?
12	MR. SULLIVAN: Object to form. Asked and
13	answered. Calls for speculation.
14	Go ahead and answer.
15	A. It would have been reasonable to discuss that
16	during the call, yes.
17	Q. (By Mr. Elster) Would you have expressed your
18	opinions about Dr. Weisman?
19	MR. SULLIVAN: Object to form. Calls for
20	speculation.
21	Go ahead and answer.
22	A. Would I have expressed my opinions, possibly.
23	Q. (By Mr. Elster) Okay. At that time you agree
24	that you don't think he would have been a suitable
25	anesthesiologist, right, so December of 2018?

1	A. Correct.
2	Q. At that time you believe that he shouldn't
3	have been a resident anesthesiologist, right?
4	A. I believe anesthesiology was a poor fit.
5	Q. Okay. At that time did you have concerns
6	about his ability as a physician generally outside of
7	anesthesiology?
8	A. No.
9	Q. Okay. Would you have communicated any of the
10	other concerns from Dr. Benzinger, Dr. Groener, or
11	Dr. Cox during that phone call?
12	MR. SULLIVAN: I'm going to object. Calls for
13	speculation.
14	Go ahead and answer if you can.
15	A. It's possible that I would have conveyed my
16	general sort of sense of his aptitude. I don't know
17	that I would have specifically referred to comments
18	made by Dr. Cox, Groener, or Dr. Evers.
19	Q. (By Mr. Elster) And your general sense of his
20	aptitude in December of 2018 was that he should not be
21	an anesthesiologist, right?
22	A. My general sense was anesthesiology was a poor
23	fit, yes.
24	Q. Okay. Did you give any positive statements
25	about Dr. Weisman in that phone call?

1	MR. SULLIVAN: I'm going to object to form.
2	Calls for speculation.
3	Go ahead and answer.
4	A. I don't recall the specifics of the phone call
5	so I can't answer.
6	Q. (By Mr. Elster) And likewise did you give any
7	negative statements about Dr. Weisman?
8	MR. SULLIVAN: Object. Asked and answered.
9	A. Same answer.
10	Q. (By Mr. Elster) If you were to have expressed
11	the sentiment to Dr. Macario about Dr. Weisman's
12	aptitude as an anesthesiologist on this phone call,
13	don't you agree with me that that would have undermined
14	the recommendation letter that you wrote?
15	MR. SULLIVAN: I'm going to object to form.
16	Calls for speculation.
17	Go ahead and answer.
18	A. It probably would depend on how that
19	information is received in the larger context,
20	including a letter of recommendation.
21	Q. (By Mr. Elster) Okay. So the letter of
22	recommendation, and that's Exhibit 12. It's in the
23	first two pages of 691 to 692. Is this a sample of the
24	one you wrote?
25	A. It appears to be.

Q. Okay. So this one is only a page and a half
long. And some of the prior iterations we've seen from
Dr. Benzinger were longer. Sometimes double in length.
Would you have edited this down?
MR. SULLIVAN: I'm going to object to form.
Assumes facts not in evidence.
Go ahead and answer.
A. I would have to compare them side by side.
But it is in fact shorter and the font is the same and
the formatting is the same, then presumably, yes, I
edited out some things.
Q. (By Mr. Elster) Are there any other
substantive iterations of the letter that you would
have signed for Dr. Weisman other than what we see in
691 to 692?
A. I don't believe so. I'm not in the routine of
doing extra work.
Q. So if there was a letter that was sent to
Stanford, it would basically be this one we see in 691
and 692?
MR. SULLIVAN: I'm going to object to form.
The letter sent to Stanford is going to speak for
itself.
Go ahead and answer.
A. So the letter would have been either this

1	letter or it would have been the letter that Dr.
2	Benzinger created. But it would have been one of the
3	two.
4	Q. (By Mr. Elster) Okay. As to the start of the
5	paragraph on the first page here 691 to 962, is it fair
6	to say that most of the sentiments you express here are
7	based on what others have communicated to you, not your
8	own personal observations?
9	MR. SULLIVAN: Object to form.
10	Mischaracterizes the testimony.
11	Go ahead and answer.
12	A. Well, as I emphatically stated previously, I
13	did have interactions with Dr. Weisman. I speak
14	spoke to his clinical acumen. So I think it's a
15	combination of my personal experience along with what I
16	gathered from a review of his evaluations.
17	Q. (By Mr. Elster) As far as you're aware has
18	that letter, the first two pages, is that the version
19	of the letter that was sent to Dr. Kaye and then Dr.
20	Fox who was at the University of Chicago?
21	MR. SULLIVAN: Object to form. Those letters
22	will speak for themselves.
23	Go ahead and answer.
24	A. Again, it would have either been this letter
25	or it would have been the one that Dr. Benzinger

created. If it was being asked of me to send as the
program director, I might have changed the signature.
But other than that, there wouldn't have been any big
changes.
Q. (By Mr. Elster) 695. So this is as of
October of 2018, the top e-mail that you sent. What
reports would you have sent at that time as I
understand it's changed to the left here, September of
2021?
MR. SULLIVAN: Doctor, I at least encourage
you to read the just the e-mails on 695.
A. Okay.
So with regards to the ABA, we are required as
a program every six months to basically comment on
whether the resident is making is satisfactory or
unsatisfactory.
Q. (By Mr. Elster) Okay.
A. With regards to the ACGME, that probably
refers to milestone evaluations.
Q. And were those sent at that time period?
A. To my knowledge.
Q. Okay. And the e-mail below that at 2:33
p.m two below that. It says: I am committed to
supporting your application for whichever specialty you
choose. And this is September of 2018?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Α. Uh-huh. Why didn't you communicate -- is that actually a true statement? At the time you were committed to supporting his application for whatever specialty he chose? Α. Absolutely. But didn't you testify earlier that if it was 0. for anesthesiology you didn't think he would be a good anesthesiologist? Α. I believe what I said was I personally don't think it would have been a good choice but I would have still supported him. It does our program no good to put residents out there that aren't succeeding. But do you believe you have supported him fully? I believe we have supported him, yes. I also Α. believe that the residency program has an obligation to be truthful when we recommend residents to other programs or to other employees. With those two statements in mind, yes, I do think we've supported him. Did you ever ask that he sign a FERPA waiver 0. for the release of his file? Α. I know that that was included in documentation so yes.

1	Q. For his own file he needed to sign a FERPA
2	waiver?
3	A. I believe the FERPA waiver was in the context
4	of sending a letter of recommendation somewhere.
5	Q. Refer you to Exhibit 13. And we talked about
6	some of these before. This is when Dr. Weisman was
7	still at the residency program. You wouldn't have
8	knowledge of any of the instances described on 2730,
9	2731, and 2733? You can take a look at them.
10	MR. SULLIVAN: You want to read those, Doctor?
11	Q. (By Mr. Elster) 2733 we looked at earlier but
12	let's include it again.
13	A. Okay.
14	Q. Am I correct that you wouldn't have any
15	firsthand knowledge of any of the instances there?
16	A. I don't believe so, no.
17	Q. Okay. You don't? Okay. I'm just going to
18	move on.
19	A. Okay.
20	Q. Exhibit 14 is 2908 to 2924. And this appears
21	to be a few documents we've been talking about,
22	evaluation roles and what have been
23	A. Submitted to them.
24	Q submitted to the evaluations. I want to
25	see if this is what we've been talking about. So as we

1	go through if you gan identify what thego are?
	go through if you can identify what these are?
2	A. So these appear to be notifications of
3	rotations as well as satisfactory or unsatisfactory to
4	the ABA.
5	Q. And is that just the first two pages, 2908 and
6	2909, or does it go beyond?
7	A. It looks like it goes beyond that.
8	Q. When does it stop?
9	A. It looks like it stops at 2913.
10	Q. Okay. So this would be 2908 to 2913 would
11	be an example of a six-month report sent to the ABA?
12	A. What we send every six months, yes.
13	Q. Okay. But it's sent every six months. And
14	who would be responsible for completing this?
15	A. Are you asking who actually submits it?
16	Q. Who would be responsible for the contents?
17	A. It would be the program director.
18	Q. Okay. So this would have been Dr. Benzinger
19	in 2017?
20	A. Correct.
21	Q. Okay. The next set of documents on 2914, what
22	is that?
23	A. These look like the reports that are sent to
24	the ACGME. So the milestone evaluations.
25	Q. Prior to September of 2021 did you consider

1	these to be compliant with the summative evaluation
2	requirement?
3	A. So I've answered this previously. But to
4	reiterate, we believed that the document that we put
5	together once a resident completed the program met that
6	requirement.
7	Q. And did
8	A Dr. Weisman leaving early was a one off,
9	and so we used the milestone evaluation in lieu of what
10	we thought was the summative evaluation.
11	Q. So beginning on 2914, would this be an example
12	of what you used to in lieu of a summative evaluation?
13	A. Correct.
14	Q. And this would be just sent to the ACGME?
15	A. It would have been sent to the ACGME. But in
16	Dr. Weisman's instance, he also asked for these to be
17	sent to other programs as well.
18	Q. Okay. 2914, and it's sideways, in this
19	probation and remediation document.
20	A. Okay.
21	Q. Do you know what that's referring to?
22	A. Not intimately. But looking at the date, I'm
23	assuming this referred to his internship year.
24	Q. Okay. So are you suggesting that interns are
25	on probation or remediation or is this?

1	A. I'm suggesting that given that that's checked
2	that he must have been placed on probation as an
3	intern.
4	Q. Okay.
5	A. I mean, at least that's what the form
6	suggests. Again, I don't have intimate knowledge of
7	this.
8	Q. Do you have any knowledge of him being placed
9	on probation?
10	A. I believe that that was a question that I
11	asked of Dr. Benzinger because I had to fill out a form
12	on behalf of Dr. Weisman.
13	Q. Okay.
14	A. And I believe in that communications with Dr.
15	Benzinger I was led to believe that he had not been
16	placed on probation.
17	Q. Would you agree with me that this suggests
18	that he was to the contrary placed on probation?
19	A. I agree that that form this form would lead
20	one to that conclusion.
21	Q. The levels the Levels 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5?
22	A. Uh-huh.
23	Q. Is there any sort of rubric explanation as to
24	what those generally mean?
25	A. I mean there's verbiage that are associated

with each of these levels. Plainly Level 1 is what you	
would associate with, you know, a novice. Level 5 is	
sort of expert or aspirational level.	
Q. Do the levels correspondence to the years of	
the residency program? So if you're at Level 1, that	
would be you're corresponding you're performing	
consistent with?	
A. Not necessarily. But it is common that as you	
progress through the residency, then the level should	
be close to their level of training but it's not like	
an exact correlation. It will depend on the resident.	
Q. It's a rough equivalency though?	
A. I think that's fair.	
Q. Okay. Is the remainder of this document all	
considered the milestone evaluation, 2914 to 2924?	
A. 2922 does not look to be a milestone	
evaluation, no.	
Q. Do you know what that is?	
A. This looks to be an example of the six-month	
evaluation that we do with the residents.	
Q. And this is just internal?	
A. I think that we use when I was the program	
director I would use these to help complete the	
milestone evaluations. But, I guess, yeah, I would say	
these are internal.	

Q. Okay. If we can flip to Exhibit 15, I want to
ask about your e-mail. So at 7:59 p.m. you said: I
really don't like that I inherited this problem. What
are you referring to?
A. Well, any time a resident leaves a program
it's a problem. It's problematic.
Q. How many residents left the program when you
were program director?
A. I think I answered that question before.
There was one that left voluntarily and then there was
one that was asked to leave for cause.
Q. If we can flip to Exhibit 18. This Dr.
Avidan, did he succeed Dr. Evens?
A. Dr. Avidan, yes.
Q. Oh, it's pronounced Avidan?
A. Avidan.
Q. Okay. I want to ask about your e-mail on the
become of 3720. Who's the Bruno?
A. He Bruno was one of the chief residents at
that time.
Q. "Bruno has asked that in preparation for
recruitment season I say a few words about Jeff
Weisman." What is the where is the context of this
e-mail?
A. I believe the next sentence gives the context.

1	Or the next paragraph maybe. I think this was in
2	reference to what we call an all resident meeting.
3	It's actually in the subject. I'm sorry. All resident
4	meeting.
5	Q. Okay. So there would have been a meeting
6	sometime after this e-mail, an all resident meeting in
7	which Dr. Weisman was discussed?
8	A. No. I don't think we discussed anyone by
9	name. I think what we discussed was that there were
10	residents that had left.
11	Q. Okay. So what few words were said about Dr.
12	Weisman?
13	A. If you're asking me what specifically did I
14	say, I don't remember.
15	Q. What generally did you say?
16	A. Well, it's, you know, all this stuff is
17	treated confidentially. But from the resident
18	perspective, if you're not the resident that's involved
19	it can be a little concerning when people suddenly
20	disappear from the program. And so I think what I was
21	trying to do was, in general terms, explain that there
22	were residents that had left for personal reasons.
23	Q. Wasn't this over a year, 'cause this is 2019?
24	A. Uh-huh.
25	Q. Didn't Dr. Weisman leave a year prior?

A. Apparently.
Q. Okay. So what was there a reason a year
later there was a residents discussion about this?
A. I think I referenced that elsewhere in the
e-mail, "We're at a point in the residency" in the
first paragraph. "We're at a point in the residency
where about half the residents know them and half
don't." So there were still residents there that knew
that they had left.
Q. In the second paragraph of that e-mail at 9:23
a.m. you stated in parentheses: There's probably more
that could have been done for Dr. Weisman. What more
could have been done?
A. I'm not sure what I was referring to
specifically.
Q. Is that a true statement, that more could have
been done?
A. It's hard to know. I wasn't the program
director when he was here.
Q. Okay. Do you agree with the contents of this
e-mail you sent on 9:23 a.m.?
A. I must have had reason to agree with it or I
wouldn't have written it down.
Q. Okay. Do you agree with it now?
A. I'm not sure.

1	Q. You don't know if you agree with this e-mail
2	that you sent?
3	A. Well, at the time I wrote this e-mail I didn't
4	have privy to all the documents that I have now.
5	Q. Okay. So privy to documents, is there
6	something that has changed your opinion since
7	A I think if you look at the documents
8	Q Hold on. Since October of 2019, has
9	something have you become privy to something that
10	has changed your what you wrote here?
11	A. So, some of these documents I wasn't privy to
12	at that time when I wrote that e-mail.
13	Q. Okay.
14	A. And I think when you look at these in whole,
15	my impression is that the program actually did a fairly
16	good job trying to be supportive. So I'm not sure that
17	I would still agree with that statement.
18	Q. But at the time you wrote this
19	A You've already asked this question.
20	Q. Okay. And I haven't finished the question
21	yet.
22	At the time you wrote this and before your
23	deposition today, did you ever express to anyone that
24	you thought the program was adequately supportive of
25	Dr. Weisman?

1	A. Can you repeat the question?
2	Q. Before the deposition?
3	A. Uh-huh.
4	Q. Had you ever expressed to anyone other than
5	your attorney that the program was supportive of Dr.
6	Weisman?
7	A. If you're asking me to recall a specific
8	conversation, I'm not sure.
9	Q. And I'm not. I'm asking if you expressed it.
10	A. If I've expressed the sentiment that I think
11	the program tried to support Dr. Weisman?
12	Q. Right.
13	A. I believe I expressed that sentiment, yes.
14	Q. Are there any specific examples you can think
15	of now that the program could have done differently
16	with respect to Dr. Weisman?
17	MR. SULLIVAN: Object to form. Calls for
18	speculation.
19	Go ahead and answer.
20	A. Well, I think one of the communications from
21	Dr. Benzinger alluded to the fact that I think it
22	was actually in his letter of recommendation that
23	admitting Dr. Weisman into the ASAP, the A-S-A-P
24	research track, in retrospect probably wasn't the best
25	idea. So that would I think have allowed Dr. Weisman

1	to concentrate more on clinical or acquisition of
2	clinical skills
3	Q. (By Mr. Elster) Anything other than that?
4	A. I think the program did a lot to try to
5	accommodate Dr. Weisman, so I can't think of anything
6	specifically.
7	Q. Exhibit 19. We can go to 3832 to 3833. This
8	is and I'm asking about the e-mail 10:24 p.m. on
9	3832.
10	A. Okay.
11	Q. And it goes into the next page. There was a
12	time line?
13	A. Uh-huh.
14	Q. Some sort of indication of what was done in
15	terms of letters or requests being sent out?
16	A. Uh-huh.
17	Q. We haven't talked about Dr. Baxton?
18	A. Uh-huh.
19	Q. UYC, September 23rd, 2020. Did have any
20	communications with Dr. Baxton?
21	A. I believe he's the individual that asked
22	that asked for the summative evaluation. That's where
23	that whole issue came up.
24	Q. And that would have happened in September
25	2020, is that correct, in looking at this?

1	A. If I apparently, yeah.
2	Q. Okay. At that time did he indicate to you
3	that a summative evaluation was needed?
4	A. It says that in the earlier e-mail, yes.
5	Q. Okay. And do you agree with that; does that
6	sound right?
7	A. Do I agree that he requested a summative
8	evaluation?
9	Q. From you in September 2020?
10	A. Assuming that's the right date, yes.
11	Q. Okay. Did you provide one in September of
12	2020?
13	A. I don't think we provided one in September
14	2020, no.
15	Q. Did you ever provide him one?
16	A. We provided one. I don't know where we sent
17	it. I'm not sure if we sent it to Baxton to Dr.
18	Baxton or somewhere else.
19	Q. Where would you have sent it if not him?
20	A. I'm not sure.
21	Q. So I'm going to ask you. I only have two
22	copies but I'll give you my copy of documents bates
23	labeled 4057 to 4059.
24	MS. RUTTER: It was marked as Benzinger
25	Exhibit 37 yesterday.

1	Q. (By Mr. Elster) Yeah. Exhibit 37.
	-
2	What's the first page?
3	A. Are you talking about 4057?
4	Q. I am. Is that an e-mail?
5	A. Looks like an e-mail from Lauren, yes.
6	Q. Okay. Attached to that appears to be like a
7	track change or edited version of a letter.
8	A. Uh-huh. Uh-huh.
9	Q. Who did the editing on that?
10	A. I would assume it's probably Lauren.
11	Q. Okay. Would anyone else have worked on the
12	letter other than Lauren Gibson and you?
13	A. I'm sure that she asked for input from myself
14	and Dr. Mitchell, yes.
15	Q. Dr. Mitchell would have had input on it too?
16	A. Dr. Mitchell was the program director, I
17	believe, at the time of this, yes, 2022.
18	Q. Would Dr. Mitchell have had any firsthand
19	training or experience with Dr. Weisman?
20	A. I would have to look at Dr. Weisman's rotation
21	schedule's to know if they overlapped.
22	Q. What's the date of the cover letter the
23	cover e-mail, 4057?
24	A. February 2022.
25	Q. Okay. Why would there be why were there

1	revisions being made in February of this year?
2	MR. SULLIVAN: Objection. Asked and answered.
3	Go ahead and answer.
4	A. If your question is why are there track
5	changes to this?
6	Q. (By Mr. Elster) Correct.
7	A. Because I think what Lauren did was she took
8	what we typically provide to a graduating resident and
9	tried to tailor it to Dr. Weisman.
10	Q. Okay.
11	A. So, for example, Dr. Weisman may not have
12	completed PACU TEE ACT/float, OB, Regional and Float,
13	which is why those are crossed out.
14	Q. Okay.
15	A. So rather than create a whole new document de
16	novo, she probably took a preexisting example and tried
17	to tailor it to Dr. Weisman.
18	Q. But in February of 2022 you were you were
19	no longer the head of the program?
20	A. Correct.
21	Q. So why would you have been included on this?
22	A. I think she was looking for input into the
23	letter.
24	Q. Flip to Exhibit 21.
25	MR. SULLIVAN: I'm sorry what was this one.

1	MR. ELSTER: 21.
2	MR. SULLIVAN: Thanks.
3	Q. (By Mr. Elster) Did you receive any inquiries
4	from Harvard about Dr. Weisman?
5	A. I don't believe so.
6	Q. Okay. Do you know if he was attempting to
7	apply there in August of 2018?
8	A. To Harvard? I don't believe I knew that.
9	Q. Did he ever request you to complete any
10	documentation before August 28th of 2018 to support him
11	in transferring?
12	A. I don't know. I know that he requested me to
13	submit documentation on his behalf. I don't know if it
14	was prior to August of 2018 though.
15	Q. If before August of August or if he
16	would have requested this in August of 2018 would you
17	have completed it?
18	A. Yes.
19	Q. Exhibit 22. This is the following day.
20	A. Okay.
21	Q. Where Dr. Weisman makes a request to you for
22	the ACGME evaluation form and they also requested a few
23	different things.
24	A. Uh-huh.
25	Q. Did you comply with this request here for

1	information?
2	A. I believe so. And I believe this is this
3	was what prompted me to reach out to Dr. Benzinger to
4	make sure that I was filling this out correctly on Dr.
5	Weisman's behalf.
6	Q. Okay. Do you know if anything was sent to
7	Harvard?
8	A. I have no reason to believe it wasn't sent to
9	Harvard if that was the request.
10	Q. Flip to Exhibit 23.
11	Do you know who Ann Backus is?
12	A. I do not.
13	Q. I guess would it would it be surprise
14	would it be surprising to know that Harvard never
15	received any information from Washington University?
16	MR. SULLIVAN: Object to the form of the
17	question. Assumes facts not in evidence. Calls for
18	speculation.
19	Go ahead and answer.
20	A. I would be surprised if that was the case,
21	yes.
22	Q. (By Mr. Elster) Do you think as the program
23	director at the time you had an obligation to at least
24	release that information?
25	MR. SULLIVAN: Objection. Asked and answered.

1	Go ahead and answer.
2	A. Yeah. If it was requested on his behalf,
3	yeah, we should have.
4	Q. Who would have personally sent that
5	information?
6	A. It probably would have been whoever the admin
7	was at that time. Might have been Stephanie but I'm
8	I'm not certain.
9	Q. I think we talked about this a little bit,
10	Exhibit 24. It's a two page.
11	A. Okay.
12	Q. After Doctor after you attempted to e-mail
13	to Dr. Patil did you try to get in contact with Dr.
14	Patil to send the information though other means?
15	A. Other than e-mail?
16	Q. Correct.
17	A. I know I never spoke with her. I think e-mail
18	would have been the only venue I would have tried to
19	communicate with her to send her this.
20	MR. ELSTER: Let's take a quick break and let
21	me meet with the client to see if I have anything else.
22	VIDEOGRAPHER: We're off the record at 1:56
23	p.m.
24	(Short break.)
25	VIDEOGRAPHER: We're back on the record at

_	
1	2:22 p.m.
2	Q. (By Mr. Elster) Dr. Thompson, of the
3	recent or what percentage, I guess you'd say, of
4	recent anesthesiology graduates have employers or
5	perspective employers contact you when you were
6	department head?
7	A. When I was the program director?
8	Q. Yeah.
9	A. What percentage?
10	Q. Yeah.
11	A. I'd be guessing but it's and I also guess
12	it depends what your question is. Every single
13	employer has to contact the program for training
14	verification. Is that what you mean?
15	Q. Okay. So training verification that they
16	completed the program, there needs to be some written?
17	A. Correct, documentation.
18	Q. So independent of written documentation of
19	training verification?
20	A. So you're asking about how often do I get like
21	a personal outreach to talk about or discuss a
22	particular resident?
23	Q. Sure.
24	A. Not very often.
25	Q. Okay. Less than half the time?

	A. Yeah, less than half the time.
	Q. In the instances that it did occur, what would
	be the type of situation it would be? Would it be
:	because there were particular concerns about the
	resident or just certain employers were
	A. No. Mostly it was just to check in and see
	how the resident was doing overall. Or how they did
	overall.
	Q. Okay. So less than half the time?
	A. Yeah.
	Q. Okay. Did you ever have any communications
	with anyone at Cleveland Clinic about Dr. Weisman?
	A. I don't think so. Not that I can recall.
:	Q. Do you know anyone who works in the
,	anesthesiology department at Cleveland Clinic?
	A. Do I know any one person who works at
	Cleveland Clinic?
	Q. Right.
	A. I don't think so.
	Q. While you were in as program director, was
•	there any investigation of any copyright infringement
	violations?
	A. While I was the program director? Copyright
:	infringements. I'm not sure if I was the program
	director or not but I think that there was an instance

the program director?  A. I don't. I think Jake McDowell was one of the chief residents, which would lead me to believe it was before I took over as program director.  Q. So that would have been in 2017 then?  A. Yeah.  Q. Do you know if Dr. Weisman had any involvement in the investigation of the copyright infringement?  A. I think there was a suspicion that Dr. Weisman was the person that reported that. But I don't think anything was ever conclusively proven.  Q. Did you ever refer to Dr. Weisman as, quote, the gift that keeps on giving?  A. I think I referred to him that way, yes.  Q. What do you mean by that?  A. Exactly what it sounds like. It was a problematic instance for the program that seemingly never goes away.  Q. And when would you have said that?	1	where residents were freely sharing textbooks I think
at Wash U. when that happened.  Q. Do you know if it was before or after you were the program director?  A. I don't. I think Jake McDowell was one of the chief residents, which would lead me to believe it was before I took over as program director.  Q. So that would have been in 2017 then?  A. Yeah.  Q. Do you know if Dr. Weisman had any involvement in the investigation of the copyright infringement?  A. I think there was a suspicion that Dr. Weisman was the person that reported that. But I don't think anything was ever conclusively proven.  Q. Did you ever refer to Dr. Weisman as, quote, the gift that keeps on giving?  A. I think I referred to him that way, yes.  Q. What do you mean by that?  A. Exactly what it sounds like. It was a problematic instance for the program that seemingly never goes away.  Q. And when would you have said that?	2	on a website. And I think that was investigated. I'm
Q. Do you know if it was before or after you were the program director?  A. I don't. I think Jake McDowell was one of the chief residents, which would lead me to believe it was before I took over as program director.  Q. So that would have been in 2017 then?  A. Yeah.  Q. Do you know if Dr. Weisman had any involvement in the investigation of the copyright infringement?  A. I think there was a suspicion that Dr. Weisman was the person that reported that. But I don't think anything was ever conclusively proven.  Q. Did you ever refer to Dr. Weisman as, quote, the gift that keeps on giving?  A. I think I referred to him that way, yes.  Q. What do you mean by that?  A. Exactly what it sounds like. It was a problematic instance for the program that seemingly never goes away.  Q. And when would you have said that?	3	not sure if I was the program director but I know I was
the program director?  A. I don't. I think Jake McDowell was one of the chief residents, which would lead me to believe it was before I took over as program director.  Q. So that would have been in 2017 then?  A. Yeah.  Q. Do you know if Dr. Weisman had any involvement in the investigation of the copyright infringement?  A. I think there was a suspicion that Dr. Weisman was the person that reported that. But I don't think anything was ever conclusively proven.  Q. Did you ever refer to Dr. Weisman as, quote, the gift that keeps on giving?  A. I think I referred to him that way, yes.  Q. What do you mean by that?  A. Exactly what it sounds like. It was a problematic instance for the program that seemingly never goes away.  Q. And when would you have said that?	4	at Wash U. when that happened.
A. I don't. I think Jake McDowell was one of the chief residents, which would lead me to believe it was before I took over as program director.  Q. So that would have been in 2017 then?  A. Yeah.  Q. Do you know if Dr. Weisman had any involvement in the investigation of the copyright infringement?  A. I think there was a suspicion that Dr. Weisman was the person that reported that. But I don't think anything was ever conclusively proven.  Q. Did you ever refer to Dr. Weisman as, quote, the gift that keeps on giving?  A. I think I referred to him that way, yes.  Q. What do you mean by that?  A. Exactly what it sounds like. It was a problematic instance for the program that seemingly never goes away.  Q. And when would you have said that?	5	Q. Do you know if it was before or after you were
chief residents, which would lead me to believe it was before I took over as program director.  Q. So that would have been in 2017 then?  A. Yeah.  Q. Do you know if Dr. Weisman had any involvement in the investigation of the copyright infringement?  A. I think there was a suspicion that Dr. Weisman was the person that reported that. But I don't think anything was ever conclusively proven.  Q. Did you ever refer to Dr. Weisman as, quote, the gift that keeps on giving?  A. I think I referred to him that way, yes.  Q. What do you mean by that?  A. Exactly what it sounds like. It was a problematic instance for the program that seemingly never goes away.  Q. And when would you have said that?	6	the program director?
9 before I took over as program director.  Q. So that would have been in 2017 then?  A. Yeah.  Q. Do you know if Dr. Weisman had any involvement in the investigation of the copyright infringement?  A. I think there was a suspicion that Dr. Weisman was the person that reported that. But I don't think anything was ever conclusively proven.  Q. Did you ever refer to Dr. Weisman as, quote, the gift that keeps on giving?  A. I think I referred to him that way, yes.  Q. What do you mean by that?  A. Exactly what it sounds like. It was a problematic instance for the program that seemingly never goes away.  Q. And when would you have said that?	7	A. I don't. I think Jake McDowell was one of the
Q. So that would have been in 2017 then?  A. Yeah.  Q. Do you know if Dr. Weisman had any involvement in the investigation of the copyright infringement?  A. I think there was a suspicion that Dr. Weisman was the person that reported that. But I don't think anything was ever conclusively proven.  Q. Did you ever refer to Dr. Weisman as, quote, the gift that keeps on giving?  A. I think I referred to him that way, yes.  Q. What do you mean by that?  A. Exactly what it sounds like. It was a problematic instance for the program that seemingly never goes away.  Q. And when would you have said that?	8	chief residents, which would lead me to believe it was
A. Yeah.  Q. Do you know if Dr. Weisman had any involvement in the investigation of the copyright infringement?  A. I think there was a suspicion that Dr. Weisman was the person that reported that. But I don't think anything was ever conclusively proven.  Q. Did you ever refer to Dr. Weisman as, quote, the gift that keeps on giving?  A. I think I referred to him that way, yes.  Q. What do you mean by that?  A. Exactly what it sounds like. It was a problematic instance for the program that seemingly never goes away.  Q. And when would you have said that?	9	before I took over as program director.
Q. Do you know if Dr. Weisman had any involvement in the investigation of the copyright infringement?  A. I think there was a suspicion that Dr. Weisman was the person that reported that. But I don't think anything was ever conclusively proven.  Q. Did you ever refer to Dr. Weisman as, quote, the gift that keeps on giving?  A. I think I referred to him that way, yes.  Q. What do you mean by that?  A. Exactly what it sounds like. It was a problematic instance for the program that seemingly never goes away.  Q. And when would you have said that?	10	Q. So that would have been in 2017 then?
in the investigation of the copyright infringement?  A. I think there was a suspicion that Dr. Weisman was the person that reported that. But I don't think anything was ever conclusively proven.  Q. Did you ever refer to Dr. Weisman as, quote, the gift that keeps on giving?  A. I think I referred to him that way, yes.  Q. What do you mean by that?  A. Exactly what it sounds like. It was a problematic instance for the program that seemingly never goes away.  Q. And when would you have said that?	11	A. Yeah.
A. I think there was a suspicion that Dr. Weisman was the person that reported that. But I don't think anything was ever conclusively proven.  Q. Did you ever refer to Dr. Weisman as, quote, the gift that keeps on giving?  A. I think I referred to him that way, yes.  Q. What do you mean by that?  A. Exactly what it sounds like. It was a problematic instance for the program that seemingly never goes away.  Q. And when would you have said that?	12	Q. Do you know if Dr. Weisman had any involvement
was the person that reported that. But I don't think anything was ever conclusively proven.  Q. Did you ever refer to Dr. Weisman as, quote, the gift that keeps on giving?  A. I think I referred to him that way, yes.  Q. What do you mean by that?  A. Exactly what it sounds like. It was a problematic instance for the program that seemingly never goes away.  Q. And when would you have said that?	13	in the investigation of the copyright infringement?
anything was ever conclusively proven.  Q. Did you ever refer to Dr. Weisman as, quote, the gift that keeps on giving?  A. I think I referred to him that way, yes.  Q. What do you mean by that?  A. Exactly what it sounds like. It was a problematic instance for the program that seemingly never goes away.  Q. And when would you have said that?	14	A. I think there was a suspicion that Dr. Weisman
Q. Did you ever refer to Dr. Weisman as, quote, the gift that keeps on giving?  A. I think I referred to him that way, yes.  Q. What do you mean by that?  A. Exactly what it sounds like. It was a problematic instance for the program that seemingly never goes away.  Q. And when would you have said that?	15	was the person that reported that. But I don't think
the gift that keeps on giving?  A. I think I referred to him that way, yes.  Q. What do you mean by that?  A. Exactly what it sounds like. It was a  problematic instance for the program that seemingly  never goes away.  Q. And when would you have said that?	16	anything was ever conclusively proven.
A. I think I referred to him that way, yes.  Q. What do you mean by that?  A. Exactly what it sounds like. It was a  problematic instance for the program that seemingly  never goes away.  Q. And when would you have said that?	17	Q. Did you ever refer to Dr. Weisman as, quote,
Q. What do you mean by that?  A. Exactly what it sounds like. It was a problematic instance for the program that seemingly never goes away.  Q. And when would you have said that?	18	the gift that keeps on giving?
A. Exactly what it sounds like. It was a problematic instance for the program that seemingly never goes away.  Q. And when would you have said that?	19	A. I think I referred to him that way, yes.
problematic instance for the program that seemingly never goes away.  Q. And when would you have said that?	20	Q. What do you mean by that?
never goes away.  Q. And when would you have said that?	21	A. Exactly what it sounds like. It was a
Q. And when would you have said that?	22	problematic instance for the program that seemingly
	23	never goes away.
A. I don't recall specifically. I would guess it	24	Q. And when would you have said that?
	25	A. I don't recall specifically. I would guess it

1	would have been probably 2018.
2	Q. When you were department when you were
3	A When I was program director, yes.
4	Q. And would that have been in the context of
5	what?
6	A. I don't recall.
7	Q. Who would you have repeated that to?
8	A. I don't recall.
9	Q. Would it have been people at Washington
10	University?
11	A. Probably.
12	Q. Okay. Did Dr. Weisman ever express any
13	concern to you that Dr. Benzinger would make negative
14	statements to other hospitals about his residency
15	training?
16	MR. SULLIVAN: Object to form. Vague.
17	Go ahead and answer.
18	A. That Dr. Benzinger would make negative
19	comments to other hospitals?
20	Q. (By Mr. Elster) Correct.
21	A. Did Dr. Weisman ever communicate that with me?
22	Q. Yeah.
23	A. Not that I recall.
24	Q. Did you ever make any assurances to Dr.
25	Weisman that those types of things wouldn't happen?

1	MR. SULLIVAN: Object to form. Vague.
2	Go ahead and answer.
3	A. I don't recall if that ever happened or not.
4	Q. (By Mr. Elster) You mentioned I believe that
5	there was a resident who left voluntarily when you were
6	program director, right?
7	A. Correct.
8	Q. And you also mentioned that there was a
9	separate resident who left for cause; is that right?
10	A. Correct.
11	Q. And that would have been in the years of 2018
12	and 2020; is that right?
13	A. That sounds right.
14	Q. Okay. Is it just one person for each category
15	leaving voluntarily and leaving for cause?
16	A. As best I can remember, yes.
17	Q. Did those individuals receive summative
18	evaluations?
19	A. I don't believe so, no. I don't think so.
20	Q. Okay. The person who left voluntarily, was
21	that a resignation?
22	A. I guess, yeah. I guess so.
23	Q. What was that person's name?
24	MR. SULLIVAN: I'm going to object and
25	instruct the witness not to disclose the name of any

4	wasidant under the fundamental winks of muivages under
1	resident under the fundamental right of privacy under
2	the Delmar Gardens case. It would involve sensitive
3	and confidential personal information and records.
4	Q. (By Mr. Elster) Do you know who the person's
5	name is? Or the person's name?
6	A. Yes.
7	Q. Okay. And you're still going to decline and
8	refuse to answer the question?
9	A. On the advice of counsel, yes.
10	MR. ELSTER: I will certify that question
11	then.
12	Q. (By Mr. Elster) Similarly, do you know the
13	name of the individual resident who left for cause?
14	A. Yes.
15	MR. SULLIVAN: I'm going to okay.
16	Q. (By Mr. Elster) So you know the name.
17	Generally what was the cause?
18	MR. SULLIVAN: If you can answer it without
19	disclosing the person's name.
20	A. There was concern about illicit drug use.
21	Q. (By Mr. Elster) Diversion?
22	A. Not diversion specifically, no. Illicit drug
23	use.
24	Q. Okay. And you know the person's name and
25	you're going to decline to provide it; is that right?

MR. SULLIVAN: Yes, I would instruct the
witness not to provide.
A. Yes.
MR. ELSTER: Certify that question too.
Q. (By Mr. Elster) Exhibit Benzinger Exhibit
37. I'm going to pull it back up.
A. Is that one I already have?
Q. Yeah. It was an add on. It was going to be
an exhibit yesterday. Let me see if I can find it
here. That was the document that had the track
changed. I think you have that.
A. Yeah, somewhere.
Q. I think it's this.
A. Yeah, the second one.
Q. Right. It's that one.
A. Got it. Okay.
MR. SULLIVAN: Do you want to mark that for
sake of clarity?
MR. ELSTER: Yeah, let's do that.
(Defendant's Exhibit No. 25 was marked for
identification.)
Q. (By Mr. Elster) So the question is in 462 and
463 of that there's something labeled a final summative
evaluation. I mentioned we were talking earlier, have
you seen the final summative evaluation.

1	A. Uh-huh.
2	Q. Is that it, 462 to 463?
3	A. I would assume so, yes.
4	Q. So when I had asked you earlier have you seen
5	the final summative evaluation, is that the document
6	you were referring to that's unsigned and undated?
7	A. Looks like it, yeah.
8	Q. Okay. Are you aware of anything else that
9	would be considered a final summative evaluation from
10	Washington University for Dr. Weisman other than 462
11	and 463?
12	A. Other than what we had previously believed
13	would suffice with the milestone evaluations, no.
14	Q. So is it the current understanding that 462
15	and 463 is the final summative evaluation?
16	A. To the best of my knowledge, yes.
17	Q. Would anyone else at Washington University
18	have more knowledge as to what constitutes the final
19	summative evaluation?
20	A. It's possible that Dr. Mitchell might, because
21	I think she was the one that had to sign it. It's
22	possible that Lauren Gibson might because she was the
23	one that put it together.
24	Q. Have you seen a signed version of it?
25	A. I'm not sure if I have or not.

## Case: 4:19-cv-00075-JAR Doc. #: 268-6 Filed: 02/17/23 Page: 167 of 167 PageID #: 5227

1	Q. Do you know if one exists?
2	A. If we were asked to supply it, I'm sure one
3	exists.
4	MR. ELSTER: I don't have any further
5	questions.
6	MR. SULLIVAN: I have no questions. We will
7	read.
8	VIDEOGRAPHER: Very good. This deposition is
9	concluded at 2:32 p.m.
10	MR. SULLIVAN: E-Tran without exhibits. No
11	hard copy.
12	MS. MULLINEAUX: E-Tran with exhibits
13	attached. No hard copy.
14	MR. ELSTER: PDF condensed with exhibits.
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	